

THE LONDON QUARTERLY AND HOLBORN REVIEW

OCTOBER, 1934

JOHN TELFORD: AN APPRECIATION

IT is said that men have their metal, as of gold and silver; and the tribute to the Rev. John Telford, B.A., unanimously endorsed by the Methodist Conference at Leicester, attests the quality of its retiring Editor. It is a testimony alike to the fine gold of his character and to his splendid record.

Before his appointment, in 1905, his marked literary aptitude found frequent expression in the pages of the *London Quarterly Review*, and its files contain much of his most characteristic work. For twenty-seven years he shaped its policy and its distinguished contributors bear witness to an editor alert and discerning.

In April, 1932, on the eve of Methodist Union, the *London Quarterly Review* was amalgamated with the *Holborn Review*, under the joint editorship of Mr. Telford and the present writer. Mr. Telford remained the dominant influence.

Both journals were representative voices of orthodox Protestant Nonconformist views and culture, with the *Holborn* perhaps the more liberal in its outlook. During the period covered by Mr. Telford's editorship of the *London Quarterly*, the *Holborn Review*, formerly known as the *Primitive Methodist Quarterly Review*, was edited in succession by H. B. Kendall, B.A., J. Day Thompson, and Dr. Arthur S. Peake. On the death of Dr. Peake, Professor A. L. Humphries and Dr. W. L. Wardle shared the editorship. Theology, biblical criticism, science and philosophy, understood to include political economy as well as metaphysics and ethics, were pronounced features. Poetry, prose, and fiction in its best character and aims, also came within the scope of their responsibilities. Biography,

too, received special attention. The *London Quarterly and Holborn Review* maintains these features and, like its predecessors, finds its way into the great libraries of the country. Its constituency includes readers on the Continent and in the United States and the Colonies.

Mr. Telford is a native of Wigton. He has the seeing eye and reflects the independence and tenacity of purpose characteristic of the hardy Cumbrian stock from which he springs. He is also a man of deep piety and simple faith. For thirty-two years he filled the role of a circuit minister and his name is still fragrant in the various centres of his earlier activities. His editorial career covers a period of twenty-nine years. The periodicals under his charge maintained a high standard of literary excellence and bore no trace of the modern journalistic taint. Yet while he fostered the specific ministry of each Connexional magazine he was not indifferent to the things which make up the texture of human life. He recognized that an editor must provide, among other things, reading for the average man and woman, and that he is in duty bound to take an interest in problems that concern average men and women. Nor did he fail to remind contributors that literature deals with life.

Mr. Telford's contributions would fill many volumes, and their quality and range suggest rare diligence and versatility. He has long been accepted as a sane and competent critic with an uncommon gift for critical appreciation. He never hails an inferior book 'with rapturous delight' as if it were a masterpiece, even though the author be his friend. His flair for biography shows his art in seizing an expression and recording an attitude. And he reveals equal mastery in the art of 'literary gossip.' His review on *At John Murray's: Records of a Literary Circle*, was declared to be the best notice that appeared. For upwards of twenty years his articles and reviews proved among the most attractive features of the *London Quarterly Review* and the *Methodist Magazine*, and he contributed regularly to the *Preachers' and Class-*

Leaders' Magazine and other periodicals. His ability to divine and to interpret the main streams of current literature introduced valuable books to ministers and laymen. He also provided a rich literary fare for the general reader. Moreover, contributors found in Mr. Telford a frank yet sympathetic critic, whose knowledge and insight aided their development.

Many would like to voice their appreciation of John Telford. And they are thinking not merely of his great abilities but also of the charm of his unostentatious personality. Nothing mean or unworthy can live in his company: the spirit of entire consecration has been the master light of all his activities. Only those who have worked with him can understand with what whole-hearted zeal he has served his Church: to work with him is to get the impression that life has never bribed him to look at anything but the soul of things. In this he has maintained a strict veracity—the supreme and indispensable mark of a true editor.

During the latter phase he has lived a somewhat cloistered life. But he has browsed in pastures of his own choosing. He has walked with calm confidence into the fields of theology, philosophy and literature with probably as much sound sense and clarity of vision as the majority of men already there. The reason he has been able to maintain his activities over so long a span is that, while but a youth, he discovered the rhythm, the 'periodic beat and pulse' of a well-ordered life. And he has proved signally free from spiritual or intellectual pride. He looks at things with clear eyes and declines to write with a furred pen. His gift of language enables him to fashion the appropriate phrase in which he invariably embodies the essential idea. It is of his editorial integrity that he has never tried to be smart or cynical or 'highbrow.'

Mr. Telford is a sincere man, free from frills, and his readers may always be sure he will declare a frank and unsophisticated view. The simple truth of his life knocks at one's heart. Nor does he suffer from what is ironically

described as 'invincible' modesty, though he is not without a quiet, tough self-confidence. Yet modesty is one of the outstanding traits of this singularly unobtrusive man. But if he has no superiority complex he certainly enjoys a superior serenity and without seeking to safeguard his dignity it nevertheless remains intact.

Mr. Telford entered quite instinctively into the Methodist tradition and few have honoured it with greater fidelity. His study of Methodist history ultimately possessed him, and he has gained distinction as perhaps the greatest living authority on matters relating to the Wesleys. In pursuit of kindred studies he became one of the most familiar figures at the British Museum and the Guildhall Library, and he has held correspondence with experts in all parts of the world. His special interests bore fruit in his excellent biographies of John and Charles Wesley, and, more recently, in the Standard Edition of *The Letters of the Rev. John Wesley, A.M.*, in eight volumes, completed in his eightieth year. This monumental work contains 2,670 letters, and each volume bears evidence of patient and exhaustive research. With scrupulous care Mr. Telford details the manifold sources of his indebtedness and pays generous tributes to previous collectors. But when all is said the Standard Edition remains an amazing achievement. Its vital significance to Methodism has not yet been adequately appreciated.

The Introduction and Notes throw interesting sidelights on Wesley and his correspondents. Mr. Telford's reference to the period covered by Wesley's letters is typical of his concise and illuminating method: 'He (Wesley) was eighteen when he wrote to the Treasurer of Charterhouse; but his style is as clear and direct as in his maturity, and his moral scrupulousness shows with what high ideals he started life. The last letter is that to William Wilberforce, a trumpet-blast from the veteran who is putting off his armour to the noble philanthropist engaged in a mighty war against one of the most horrible wrongs suffered by mankind.' And with what

naïveté he lights up comparatively obscure events and persons: 'Wesley's first romance centres round Miss Betty Kirkham. She told Wesley that she loved him "more than all mankind, except her God and king." She seems to have married afterwards.'

The Standard Edition embodies Mr. Telford's mature estimate of Wesley. His opinion that the *Letters* contain Wesley's best writing, the most direct, most pungent, most practical, will scarcely be challenged. 'His whole heart and mind were absorbed in his work as an evangelist. The letters bear witness that it was no narrow view of religion which he cherished. It covered every side of his life.' The *Letters*, moreover, are justly claimed to be an invaluable introduction and supplement to Wesley's *Journal*: 'They are less known, and therefore have a freshness all their own, and bring us into close touch with the men and women who laboured with Wesley in all parts of the kingdom and in America. They form the most intimate portrait of Wesley we possess. Wesley is here in his habit as he lived.'

Then, too, with characteristic discernment, Mr. Telford notes that the *Letters* really form the marching orders of the Evangelical Revival, and fill up many gaps in our knowledge of the events of that great awakening: 'Wesley had to keep the fires burning in three kingdoms, and much of this had to be done through his correspondence. He was, indeed, a true ἐπίσκοπος. The letters were an extension of his cure of souls and of his oversight of the scattered societies.' They are indeed all that Mr. Telford claims them to be: the seventy years' panorama of the Evangelical Revival. Few men have maintained so keen an interest or been more completely fitted for their task. Always eager about the subject in hand, Mr. Telford seems to gain a new access of power when his writing concerns the Wesleys, as if secret springs found their outlet in pursuit of his most intimate interests.

It would be difficult to praise too highly Mr. Telford's powers of concentration. His facility, too, astonishes. He

is a rapid reader and writes without strain. It is significant that during the last year of his active ministry he published *The Treasure House of Charles Wesley* and *The New Methodist Hymn Book Illustrated in History and Experience*.

Mr. Telford's energy has often provoked envy. To find his equal as an early riser it may be necessary to go back to John Wesley himself. One of Mr. Telford's friends, who still thrills to the wonder of the dawn, used to pride himself on rising with the lark. But since his association with Mr. Telford his pride is all rags. More than once he entertained the fond dream of forestalling the senior Editor. But that dream remained unrealized. He did not understand that it might involve sitting up all night and that even then the 'venerable' young man would be at the office before him. A round ecclesiastical hat, and occasionally, an unecclesiastical umbrella, were infallible signs that the senior had caught the workmen's train. But it was never wise to take too much for granted, for suddenly they would be missed from their accustomed place, and whoever sought an interview would learn with dismay that the Editor was 'not in.' He had already started for the British Museum with his bag of manuscripts and books or had returned to the quiet of his study at Dorking to divine the promise of a new writer or, like Dr. Johnson, to tear the heart out of the latest book.

It is held that you cannot possibly proceed with a coherent argument unless you discharge yourself of your wrath. But I recollect no experience when Mr. Telford was provoked, though I remember more than one occasion when he was painfully sensitive and had a right to be indignant. Yet he retained his equanimity and would not allow his colleague to enter the lists on his behalf. It is his rule of life to leave the bitter word unspoken. And I should not be surprised to learn that the sun had never gone down on his wrath. Free from intrigue, with no itch for display, he is beloved for his deep sense of honour and his reverence for spiritual values. Refined in manners and temperament he is the soul of courtesy.

Nor are his charm and kindness qualified by the company in which he finds himself: these qualities are part of the man, instinctive in him. He is that rare and fascinating paradox—a Victorian with a twentieth-century twinkle in his eyes; and thus we find in him a vitality which is distinctively modern.

Mr. Telford has pursued the even tenor of his way wedded to a task which has become part of his very life and which he naturally finds difficult to relinquish. He began his life's work in the spirit of his great hero: 'Leisure and I have taken leave of one another: I propose to be busy as long as I live, if my health is so long indulged me.' And Mr. Telford's flag has 'never drooped' throughout a ministry of sixty-one years. Though his pace is slower it is evident from his article on 'Dr. Simon's Masterpiece,' in the present issue, that his thinking is no whit impaired. But though he now prefers the gradual slope to the steep ascent it is not easy to visualize him as an orthodox supernumerary. His present attitude recalls Michael Angelo's sketch of the old man with an hour glass before him, under which are inscribed the words, *ancora imparo*—'I still learn.' He carries his satchel still and remains the same reticent, high-minded, devoted servant of the Church we know him to be.

The fires and faith of Mr. Telford's youth still glow. His simple belief in Providence and his sense of mystic union with Christ deepen with the years. A rich spiritual experience is the essence of his strength and peace. He is of those who believe that God has prepared for His children some better thing than they tasted the day before. Here again is the secret of his forward look and of that endurance which is the final loyalty of faith. His secluded temperament might develop the recluse were it not for his preaching appointments on the Dorking circuit. Here, in his quaint homely fashion, he conducts a pastoral ministry among his people: 'Peace be to this house' is a familiar greeting in many village homes; and it carries with it a benediction. He himself has known trial and sorrow; he has trod the shadowed way.

But he learned the Lord's song in the night and he knows how to impart the secret of peace. He is indeed a sort of Bishop, for the worshippers at the little country chapels in which he preaches regard him lovingly as a 'Father in God.'

His experience has but deepened his humility. He holds with Mark Rutherford that a little intercourse with the immortals, or a look at the stars on a clear night, is a tolerably sure antidote to thinking too much of yourself. But above all he has not received the grace of God in vain.

I shall remember his strength, his serenity, and his beautiful spirit; and I shall always be grateful to have known John Telford in the flesh and to have shared with him a happy, though brief, fellowship at City Road.

Mr. Telford retires from the Editor's chair rich in the things upon which all vital verdicts depend. And not only readers of this journal but all who know him will salute one whose personality is uniformly toned by the mellowing rays of sunset and whose crown is a spiritual beauty reminiscent of the highest Methodist traditions.

B. AQUILA BARBER.

An Introduction to the Books of the Old Testament. By W. O. E. Osterley, D.D., and Theodore H. Robinson, D.D. (S.P.C.K. 10s. 6d.)

This volume does not go into the minute detail of Dr. Driver's work but gives a fuller account of the Old Testament books than is to be found in most English Introductions. The general subject of Hebrew metre is dealt with in a special section. The Canon and Text are first described, the Pentateuch follows in one group, then each book is taken in order. Isaiah is in three sections 1-39, Deutero-Isaiah, 40-55, Trito-Isaiah, 56-66. An analysis of the Contents, and details of source and dates are given. The reasons which justify the statement that Nehemiah preceded Ezra are clearly stated, *Esther* is described as a little historical novel, *Job* is professedly a story rather than a piece of history and deals with the intellectual struggle and spiritual agony of a man who had plumbed the depths of human suffering. The treatment of the subject is based on the best results of modern criticism, is well-arranged, and will be of constant service to students and to those who wish to grasp the structure and message of the books.

THE FUTURE OF BECHUANALAND

GENERAL HERTZOG'S recent announcement in the Union Parliament that he intends to raise the question of the absorption of the three British Protectorates of Bechuanaland, Basutoland and Swaziland has caused widespread misgiving. This is particularly so with regard to Bechuanaland. For while Basutoland and Swaziland are enclaves within Union territory, Bechuanaland is outside the Union frontier and is on the road to the north.

Since Bechuanaland is a Protectorate the Bechuana are ruled both by a European Administration and by a Native Chief. It is obvious that this is a situation that calls for statesmanship and tact above the ordinary if a proper balance is to be preserved. When the Protectorate was first set up internal affairs were left in the hands of the Chief and his advisers, Britain being responsible for 'foreign affairs' and for defence. But with the coming of Europeans into the Protectorate the White Administration extended its protection to their persons and property and began to take a part in 'home affairs.' As European influences and modes of thought penetrated the Protectorate the Administration naturally tended to encroach upon the functions and privileges of the Chief. No one denies that such encroachment has taken place. The powers of the Chief have been considerably reduced since the death of Khama, and it looks as though the Administration intends to carry the process further.

It is entirely natural that the Chief should view the tendency with concern, and that he should offer what opposition he legitimately may. Let it be noted that the present Chief is only a Regent. He will therefore be expected to hand on to his successor the prerogatives and functions of the chieftainship undiminished. If he fails to do so he will be liable to grave rebuke.

But there is something deeper than that in the disquiet with which Tshekedi views the frequent infringement of his

functions. The Chief in a Bantu tribe is looked upon as something more than a political personage. He is regarded as gathering up in himself the whole life of the tribe. He is a religious symbol of the tribal existence. He has an almost spiritual significance. Moreover, an African tribe carries subtle non-material elements in its life. It is, in fact, a singularly delicate organism, and its balance can be destroyed much more readily than it can be restored. For an outside authority, therefore, to remove a Chief or even to encroach seriously and suddenly upon his functions is to deal a blow at the whole poise and equilibrium of tribal life.

Less than three years ago the Administration removed a neighbouring Bechuana Chief from his office and sent him into permanent banishment. The Chief in question was admittedly a drunken roué and deserved all he got. But some of the men of that tribe still feel that a wound was given to something that is very precious to their corporate life. To disturb the status and functions of a Chief is one of the surest ways to bring about detribalization, that worst malady of African life.

It is but natural that under such circumstances Tshekedi should watch with misgiving every step of the Administration that looks to him like a further infringement of the powers of the Chief. It is not to be wondered at if his policy tends to become not merely cautious but even conservative. He feels that his main task is the maintenance of his chiefly prerogatives, and he is robbed thereby of the freedom of mind necessary to think constructively on the needs of his tribe or to frame a progressive policy for them. Confidence and co-operation, the essential elements in a successful Protectorate, are clearly absent.

The blame is not to be laid solely at the door of the Administration. It is not their fault that Britain has permitted lower standards of admission to the Administrative service in Bechuanaland than would be tolerated in other British territories, the recruits being often drawn, not from the usual

ranks of the Colonial service, but in many cases from the police. This practice is but another proof of the official backwater into which the Protectorate had been allowed to drift. The result is that the District Officers of the territory have tended, with their background of police life, to regard their task as the detection and punishment of crime rather than the carrying out, in co-operation with the Chiefs, of a constructive and progressive policy. Bechuanaland desperately needs the help of first-rate minds.

If the political situation in the Protectorate is bad, the economic position is worse. Poverty is deepening. There was a drop of £9,000 in the hut-tax in the last financial year, and it is estimated that ten per cent. of the tax-payers this year will be in default. The long-continued drought, the Union embargo on Bechuanaland cattle, and the draining of the man-power to the mines are combining to sink the Protectorate deeper and deeper into poverty. The population is at a standstill. The people are under-nourished and their resistance to disease is dangerously low. Scurvy and other deficiency diseases are far more common than they should be in a people living on the land. Their natural resourcefulness is being undermined. Even their minds are becoming listless and stagnant.

This is the really pressing problem of the Protectorate. The causes of the increasing poverty are largely beyond the control of the Native people. They lie in climatic changes, in world conditions, in the Union's economic nationalism, and in the steady drying-up of the country. It is of the first importance that the outstanding political issues should be settled without delay, in order that the minds of both the Chief and the Administration should be focussed upon the economic needs of the country.

When Britain extended its protection to Bechuanaland nearly fifty years ago she did so reluctantly, and throughout the half-century her interest has been half-hearted. The first person to urge Britain to set up the Protectorate

was David Livingstone, who saw the Boer farmers pushing their way into the territory, and pegging out their enormous claims. He realized that this would mean for the Bechuana the loss of their land, their tribal integrity, and their free status. So dismayed was he with the prospect that he appealed to the British Government to set up a Protectorate 'in order to protect the people from the Boers.' His appeal, coming at the same time as the scramble for Africa, moved Britain to respond though rather against her will. Her reluctance and lack of interest were shown by the appointment not of a trained officer, but of a missionary, as the first Resident Commissioner, and by the transfer, within a few years, of a large tract in the southern part of the Protectorate to Cape Colony, and by the attempt to transfer the remainder of the territory to the British South Africa Company. This attempt was frustrated by the action of the Bechuanaland Chiefs, who laid their case in person before the Queen and the Colonial Secretary. Bechuanaland remained within the British family of nations, but rather as an unwanted child.

At frequent intervals the Union of South Africa, always hungry for more land, has turned greedy eyes upon Bechuanaland, and has offered more than once, through its responsible spokesmen, to take over the Protectorate. This proposed absorption which would have meant the extension of the Union's territory from the Indian Ocean to the Atlantic, and from the Cape to the Zambesi, has proved to be irresistibly attractive to many of the white citizens of the Union, but to the people of Bechuanaland a cause of deep dismay. The reasons for this go far back into South African history.

For generations, the Boers regarded the Native people of South Africa as less than human. Professor W. M. Macmillan quotes a letter from Mrs. Anna Steenkamp which appeared in *The Cape Monthly Magazine* in September 1876. Writing of the great Boer trek Mrs. Steenkamp says: 'Among the reasons for which we abandoned our lands and homesteads,

our country and kindred was the shameful and unjust proceedings with reference to our slaves; and yet it was not so much their freedom that drove us to such lengths, as their being placed on an equal footing with Christians, contrary to the laws of God, and the natural distinction of race and religion, so that it was intolerable for any decent Christian to bow down beneath such a yoke; wherefore we rather withdrew in order thus to preserve our doctrine in purity.' This bears out a sentence in one of Livingstone's letters, which states that the Boers would not allow him to start a mission among the Natives unless he would 'promise to teach them that the Boers are a superior race to them.' The Boers held unquestioningly that the African's black skin was a proof that he was under the curse of God, that he must be permitted no privileges, and be given no opportunities of advancement, but must remain a hewer of wood and a drawer of water for the white man. It was upon this principle and with this religious sanction that the Boers built their Native policy. They expressed their conviction in the Constitution (Grondwet) of the Transvaal Republic, where they laid it down that there shall be no equality between black and white in Church or State. The natural sequence was to deny to the Native people, not only political and social rights, but also education, evangelization and other opportunities of advancement.

The people of Bechuanaland, in common with other Bantu tribes, are aware of this traditional attitude of Boer to Bantu, and they recoil with dread from the suggestion of absorption. They realize that it will mean the application to them of all the repressive and reactionary Native legislation of the Union. They are convinced that this, in turn, will mean their complete detribalization, the probable loss of their land and their culture, and the reduction of their status from that of free men to that of helots in the land of their fathers. This dread of Boer Native policy is so deeply rooted in the Native mind that the proposal of the

Union to take over Bechuanaland cannot be regarded as workable.

It is the view of an increasing number of observers that the way forward for Bechuanaland is by completely severing its association with the Union. This was precisely one of the major issues that Chief Tshekedi journeyed to England in 1930 to discuss with the Secretary of State. The attitude of the Government seemed to be declared when, on the retirement of the Earl of Athlone, the functions of the Governor-General were divided from those of the High Commissioner. It was hoped that this would give to the latter the opportunity, previously denied him, of giving undivided attention to the three High Commission territories. But the division of the offices has accomplished disappointingly little. The High Commissioner is still tied to the Union as Britain's representative. He lives in its area and is immersed in its affairs. He has little or no freedom for the Protectorates. Clearly another step should be taken, and the High Commissioner should be relieved of all his duties to the Union. He should be free to give consecutive and constructive thought to the High Commission territories, visiting them regularly and holding conference with Chiefs and District Officers. He should have liberty to give close attention to such problems as water-shortage, poor communications, unsatisfactory food-supply, and inadequate educational and medical services. Such a decision would be full of hope for the Protectorates, and one that in the course of a few years ought to bring the beginnings of prosperity. Britain has the chance of leading the High Commission territories from wardship to self-governing status.

Bechuanaland stands midway between the areas in which two opposing types of Native policy are being tried out. To the south and east is the Union, where the Native people are suffering tribal disintegration, and being steadily assimilated to European modes of life. To the north is Northern Rhodesia, and the other British territories, where hopes are

centred upon the policy of Indirect Rule, and its deliberate attempt to preserve and develop such Native institutions, as the status of the Chiefs, and the functions of the tribal courts. Which policy shall hold the day in Bechuanaland is a question of the utmost moment for the Chief and his people. Tshekedi is studying Indirect Rule, and his mind inclines towards its adoption for his territory, though with modifications to make it suitable to Bechuana conditions.

It is for this reason, among others, that he has asked that Bechuanaland shall be transferred from the Dominions Office to the Colonial Office. The transfer would, he holds, have an almost immediate effect upon the Administrative personnel. District Officers, thereafter appointed to the territory, would necessarily have had the training usual to men in the Colonial services, and would be comparable in equipment and capacity with those appointed to other British territories. Since the same conditions of service, salary and promotion would apply, it might well be that the Protectorate would receive officers who had had experience of the working of either Indirect Rule or some other hopeful and constructive policy in other territories. The Dominions Office, as Chief Tshekedi further points out, has abundant experience of dealing with great self-governing Dominions of white people, such as Canada and Australia, but none of handling Native Chiefs or emerging tribes. The Colonial Office, on the other hand, has been garnering such experience for generations, and is giving all its attention all the time to the problems which arise in territories very similar to Bechuanaland. All the arguments would seem to favour the transfer.

It is important also to realize, that so long as Bechuana-land remains in the same Government Department as the Union of South Africa, there will be no freedom from anxiety for the Chief or his people. They would regard the transfer to the Colonial Office as the one sufficient obstacle against a possible transfer to the Union. Probably no single action

could give more relief of mind to the Bechuana. The change seems a small one to secure so considerable a result.

Given an assurance that the territory will not be handed over to the Union; given an Administrative personnel of training and competence; given a High Commissioner, free from Union entanglements and able to devote his whole time to the three Protectorates, the way of economic advance would be open. The Bechuana have no less ability than other African tribes; while some of their Chiefs, notably Tshekedi, are men of ability and character. What is needed is, first, that confidence be restored; second, that close and sympathetic study be given to the problems of the country; and third, that a policy be initiated which is both forward-looking and a natural development of African institutions and modes of thought.

A. M. CHIRGWIN, M.A.

Songs from Prison. By M. K. Gandhi. Adapted for the Press by John S. Hoyland. (Allen & Unwin. 3s. 6d.)

These translations of Indian lyrics were made in Yeravda Jail, Poona, in 1930, partly from the Upanishads and other Sanskrit Scriptures and partly from the Bhaki School of thought and devotion. Some Indian names and matter have been omitted by Mr. Hoyland. There is beautiful thought and a rich sympathy with all that suffers. The poet prays:

The face of Truth is covered with a veil of golden radiance:
Lay it aside, O God, I pray,
That I may see the light.

There is a warning to youth:

Ye that are young
Look warily how ye act:
Be zealous in pursuit of truth,
Be Steadfast-hearted,
Hope,
Be strong:
Thus doing,
Ye shall find this earth filled full of goodly things.

St. Paul might have written Mirabai's lines:

All, all I have given for God,
And my loss is great gain.

The little anthology brings us right into the heart of Indian religion.

PERSONAL MEMORIES OF SHERLOCK HOLMES

WHO 'discovered'—I do not like the word in such connexion, but it is in common use to-day—Sherlock Holmes? The reply is, as shall here, for the first time be narrated, that my wife did. She was then the wife of the late Professor G. T. Bettany, M.A., B.Sc., at one time a Cambridge 'Don,' but, later, chief Editor to Messrs. Ward, Lock, & Co.

One day a MS. entitled 'A Study in Scarlet,' penned in a beautifully clear and small round hand, arrived at Ward Lock's, and came before Bettany. As he was a science man (bracketed Third in the Natural Science Tripos) he took it home with him to say to his wife: 'You have published a novel, and have contributed stories to *Temple Bar*, *The Argosy*, and *Belgravia*, and are likely to be a better judge of fiction than I. So I should be glad if you would look through this, and tell me whether I ought to read it.'

Mrs. Bettany's first intention was to be a doctor, so she had, at one time, attended lectures, and closely studied medical science. That is, no doubt why she said to her husband: 'This is, I feel sure, by a doctor—there is internal evidence to that effect. But in any case, the writer is a born novelist. I am enthusiastic about the book, and believe it will be a great success.'

So on the strength of her opinion, Bettany recommended 'A Study in Scarlet' to Ward, Lock, & Co., who issued it as the chief item in *Beeton's Christmas Annual* for 1887.

In 1889 I became junior Editor to Ward, Lock, & Co., and Assistant Editor of *Lippincott's Magazine*, which they published on this side of the Atlantic. Looking through the firm's file copies, I came across the 1887 issue of *Beeton's Christmas Annual*, and took it to the Managing Director. 'Is anything being done with this?' I asked.

He shook his head to reply: 'It served its purpose, and did respectably as the Annual, but the sales were not great, and few reviewers had anything to say of it.'

'No,' I answered, 'so many books appear at Christmas that reviewers are not likely to write at length, or even to notice the contents of one of the many Christmas Annuals. But since then, Doyle has published *Micah Clarke*, and *The Captain of the Polestar*. The complete novel in the next issue of *Lippincott's Magazine* is "The Sign of Four," in which Sherlock Holmes is the leading character. I am as sure, as one can humanly be, that there is a great future for stories in which Sherlock Holmes figures. As you have "A Study in Scarlet," the very first story about Sherlock Holmes, I suggest that you reissue it as a book, by itself, attractively produced, and attractively illustrated. I believe it will have a huge sale, and go on selling for years.'

That is as far as I need to go. The rest of the story is public knowledge, so I pass on to tell of my first meeting with Doyle. The editor of the magazine in which the very first book I ever penned—I do not propose to mention the title here—was running, anonymously, as a serial, gave a dinner to his contributors, and among those present were Doyle and myself. In a lull of the conversation, Doyle said to the editor, 'Who is the anonymous author of that——' I must not repeat his words which were more than appreciative. The editor pointed to me, and Doyle was so good as to express his pleasure in meeting the author of the serial. Here may I interpolate that those persons who think that Doyle's interest in Spiritualism was a late development, are mistaken. I attribute his interest in, and his appreciation of my anonymously published serial to the fact that it might have been, but was not entitled, 'What happens after Death.' I did not see Doyle again till after 'The Sign of Four' had appeared in *Lippincott's*. He was then living in Tennison Road, Norwood, where he was practising as a doctor, and I remember saying to him, 'Now that you have "begun

author," as an American friend of mine calls it, mark my words if the time does not come when you will chuck medicine for literature.'

'My heart is in my work as an aurist,' he replied, 'and I shall never, as you say, chuck my medical work for literary work or for anything else.'

Though he changed his mind or, perhaps under the compelling force of circumstances, yielded to the demand for more books by his pen from a public to which he felt he had cause to be grateful, and so had no small claim on him—'chuck' his medical work, he never entirely did. When the call of his country came, Doyle, a true patriot, if ever there were one, went out as a physician with a Field Hospital to tend and to minister to the wounded in the Boer War. In a sense, he was following the noble Science of Healing when he died. His enthusiasm for the cause of Spiritualism was, I sincerely believe, in no small part due to his conviction that Spiritualism is Soul-Therapeuthy. It brought, he would have contended, healing to the hearts of those broken by the loss of loved ones in the war. It was the promise of life after death for those loved ones, and the pledge that they and those who mourned them here should one day be re-united. It restored faith in personal immortality, and all that faith in personal immortality means, to a world which was fast coming to ask itself, 'Does death end all?' In a word, Spiritualism was to Doyle the only true Cure of Souls, and in not only practising but preaching and proclaiming Spiritualism, he believed that he was best serving not only his fellows, but humanity.

So far from sharing these views, I believe him to have been grievously mistaken, and in the press and elsewhere he and I had more than one controversy, concerning which the late Mr. St. John Adcock wrote in *The Bookman*: 'Mr. Kernahan takes off the gloves in dead earnest to Sir Arthur Conan Doyle, on the subject of Spiritualism.' If Doyle took off the gloves, in hitting back in defence of the Cause to

which he gave his life, for he might have been alive to-day had he spent himself less strenuously and self-sacrificingly in championing Spiritualism, he never allowed temper to get the upper hand, but replied always with perfect courtesy. The wit who burlesqued the title of James Thomson's book of poems by dubbing London 'The City of Dreadful Knights,' had perhaps in mind a certain wealthy magnate who was said to have remarked: 'I don't feel any different' (scandalous tongues averred that 'no different' was his actual wording) 'now I'm a knight'; but Doyle was a knight of Nature's, as well as of his King's making. The Order of Knighthood, as well as he was honoured when he was bidden, 'Rise, Sir Arthur.' To a foe, in this case to an opponent, he manifested something of the chivalry of the Saxon and stainless King whose name he bore. I had said, of Doyle, that which some men would have held to be unforgivable, as when I wrote: 'By such an exhortation as "Nearly every woman is an undeveloped medium—let her try her powers!" Sir Arthur Conan Doyle threatens, in my opinion, and if his advice be followed, to become a public danger.' Yet he not only bore no resentment, but when next we met, greeted me with all the old cordiality, and laying a hand on my shoulder, said: 'There can never be any *odium theologicum* between you and me, Kernahan—isn't that so, old chap?'

Before leaving the subject of Spiritualism, may I quote a letter which, coming as it did from so militant an agnostic as the late Edward Clodd, not a little surprised me:

'MY DEAR KERNAHAN,

'Though you and I are old, and the best of friends, no two men could differ more widely about so-called religion. But I am moved to tell you that I picked up on a bookstall and read your little work on Spiritualism, and I must congratulate you on the way you marshal your evidence against Doyle. You get home every time.

'Always yours,

'EDWARD CLODD.'

I quote the letter here because I wish, in fairness, to say that if I got the better of Doyle in the controversy, that fact

was due, not to any skill of mine, but to Doyle's transparent honesty. In a sense, he was a greater enemy to Spiritualism than I was. His expressed belief in the actual existence of Fairies, and the publication by him of alleged photographs of Fairies, clothes and all—the photographs might have been those of children arrayed for a fancy dress ball—and his frank admissions concerning the drunkenness of, and the frauds practised by certain paid mediums, and of the danger attending any dabbling in the Occult by the uninformed, were more damaging to his case, than was any word of mine, and were the chief weapons in my small armoury.

Not very long before Doyle's death, one of the younger school of writers said to me: 'I had the great luck to be introduced to Sir Arthur Conan Doyle the other day. When my name, of which I did not suppose he had ever heard, was mentioned, he was so good as to say that he had read a work of mine and thought highly of it. I was immensely bucked, for I do not take him to be the sort of man to hand out bouquets all round.'

'Doyle,' I replied, 'is characteristically generous, and glad to say an appreciative word about the work of a fellow craftsman, young or old, known or unknown, but only when the appreciation is genuine. He is the soul of sincerity, and so far from being one of those cheaply effusive and cheaply expansive persons who, as you say "hand out bouquets all round," he can, when his anger is aroused by cruelty or treachery, "hand out" not "bouquets," but blows as smashing as any prizefighter's. I would rather face a pistol at five paces, than face the blaze of anger, or the cold contempt in Doyle's eyes, had I done that which gave him just cause to think me a liar, a cad, or a traitor to his or my country.'

When Jerome K. Jerome sent me a book of his dedicated 'To my big-bodied, big-brained, and big-hearted friend, Conan Doyle,' I remember writing to Jerome: 'Thank you for the book, and I say "Bravo!" to the dedication. Your

camera was truly focused when you took that happy snapshot of our friend. "Big"—big in everything—is the very word for Conan Doyle.'

That was long ago, but I have never had cause to change my opinion. Had someone said to me: 'You are mistaken about Doyle. I have reason to know, and can produce evidence to prove that he has behaved shabbily in a certain matter,' I should have replied: 'It is you who are mistaken, and I will not insult a friend of mine by so much as looking at your so-called evidence. I do not say that Doyle may not have acted mistakenly in some matter, for he is not a little of a Don Quixote, in his knightly championship of forlorn hopes and bottom dogs. But, I do emphatically say that, if all the facts were known, so far from showing Doyle in a discreditable light, they would be yet another proof of his chivalry, courage, disinterestedness and purity of motive, and perhaps of the way in which he spends himself unsparingly for some cause or some person in which or in whom his own great-heartedness has led him, perhaps mistakenly, to believe. Thank God! I have known men who keep high one's hope for the future of the race, who keep one's faith in one's fellow-creatures sweet and unshaken and such a man is Arthur Conan Doyle.'

As I have told of the 'discovery' of Sherlock Holmes, the reader may be interested to hear of one instance when the creator of that great detective was at fault.

Hearing from the Grant Allens that I was coming to spend a few days with them at their home, 'The Croft,' Hindhead, Doyle, whose own home, 'Undershaw,' was not far away, walked over on the evening of my arrival, that we might forgather, and a walk, during which he was to be of the company, was arranged for the following morning. Snow had fallen overnight, and, seeing bird footprints on the snow, he said jovially: 'You are a naturalist, Allen, so it is up to you to tell us by what bird those prints were made.' In the same leg-pulling spirit, Grant Allen replied, 'You are a detective, and

a trail-tracer, Doyle, so it is up to you to draw your deductions, and tell us, among other things—the bird, by the by, was a pheasant—whether the footprints are those of a cock or a hen.’

Doyle stooped to examine the footprints closely and minutely. ‘My first deduction,’ he said, ‘is that the bird must have been flying before it settled here, for this is where the prints begin, besides which, they are rather more sprawly—caused by the drop, I suppose—than those which follow after when the bird was walking, and left a clear-cut impression on the snow. Am I right, thus far?’

‘Right, thus far,’ was the reply, ‘but that’s not answering my question about the bird’s sex.’

‘The hen,’ mused Doyle aloud, ‘is, I think, the smaller, and may, or may not leave a smaller footprint, but I couldn’t say, offhand, whether these are on the large or on the small side. They seem to me about the same size that I have noticed on other occasions. If there were such a thing as a dropped feather somewhere, that would help me, for the hen’s plumage is homely and the cock’s gay. You are not trying to get a rise out of me, Allen, are you, on the strength of having spotted a dropped feather as we came along?’

Allen shook his head. ‘I’ve seen nothing in the way of a feather, or in any other way, and didn’t know a pheasant had been here, till noticing those footprints. And I don’t mind telling you that the footprints made by either a cock or a hen are practically the same, so far as I have observed, though I may be wrong. Now which was it—a cock or a hen?’

‘Game—no pun about pheasants intended—to you,’ was the reply, ‘for I give it up; but how on earth do you know?’

‘I should not have known, but for the snow,’ was the answer. ‘A cock pheasant—which this bird was—every now and then, as he walks, just touches the ground with the tip of his long tail. When I first saw the footprints, I followed them with my eyes to where they ran on ahead, and could

just detect where the bird's tail had very slightly brushed the surface of the snow.' He moved on a few paces to point us to just such a mark on the snow as he had described. 'There you are,' he said. Again he walked on a little way, again to stop, and again to say, 'There you are!' 'We have been talking quietly,' he went on, 'and the snow has muffled our footsteps. If you look ahead, you will see that the bird's footprints lead to those bushes on the right. He may be there now.' Then Allen clapped his hands smartly, and out of the bushes flapped a startled cock pheasant.

Allen was one of the most modest, most learned, and most lovable of men, and all the more so for his keen sense of humour. Turning to Doyle, he shrugged his shoulders in the approved Sherlock Holmes manner, and with just such a nonchalant, semi-contemptuous gesture, as one pictures the great detective making, Allen remarked: 'The solution of these supposed mysteries, is, I assure you, my dear and long-suffering Watson, as commonplace as it is simple—so simple as to be within the comprehension of a child'—and no one more enjoyed the dig at himself than did Sir Arthur-Sherlock-Holmes-Conan Doyle.

'I have to take the chair at a dinner to Dr. Mandell Creighton, Bishop of London,' Doyle said to me one day, 'and have never handled a bishop before—bishops are a bit out of my line. Sitting by, and talking to a man as his host, for a whole evening is easier, and conversation is helped, if one knows something about him. You have met Creighton, I think. What sort of a man is he?'

'A great scholar and historian—he is editor of the *English Historical Review*—for one thing,' I said. 'Than Swinburne, no one knows Elizabethan literature better, and he once said to me that Mandell Creighton's *Life of Queen Elizabeth* is the finest book on the subject ever written. Then there is Creighton, the preacher. When he is in the pulpit at Westminster Abbey or St. Paul's, you will see statesmen, men of science, and eminent men in all walks of life among the congregation. About Creighton the courtier and diplomat,

I speak only from hearsay, but I am told he was a brilliant success, when in some official role, he represented the Court of St. James's at the wedding of the Czar. In fact he is a many-sided man.'

'Thank you very much,' said Doyle. Then wagging his burly shoulders, he said in his somewhat throaty voice, 'The more sides a man has, the better, so long as he puts no "side" on.'

As the reader knows, Doyle was himself a many-sided man, doctor, novelist, historian, song-writer, politician, traveller, playwright, lecturer, and sportsman; but never have I known a man who was—I will not say more free from, but wholly incapable of 'side' or any sort of literary affectation, as he. When Mr. Richard le Gallienne sent me his *Religion of a Literary Man*, I wrote him, and with Doyle in mind, 'Why not, "The Religion of a Man"—that counts for most, and should come first—"of letters"? And why should a literary man have his own particular brand of religion? Let us hope your book is not followed by others, "The Faith of a Farmer," "The Beliefs of a Bicyclist," and so on. Somebody remarked recently that, in these days, as in all days, his own and masculine sex might be divided into men, male beings—and skunks.' Be that as it may, it is as a MAN that Conan Doyle most stands out in my memory.

Now to turn to another matter. In an Introduction which I contributed to *Jerome K. Jerome: His Life and Work*, by Mr. Alfred Moss, I wrote: 'Two of the best Christians I have ever known would not be so designated in the sense in which the Christian faith and creed are held by the Churches. I refer to Jerome K. Jerome, and Arthur Conan Doyle.' No one demurred because I had thus written of Jerome, but I received several letters of regret that I had thus written of Doyle. I stand by my assertion that Doyle was, in practice, a better Christian than are some of us who profess the Christian faith. In proof thereof, I instance two happenings both within my personal and positive knowledge.

A man whom Doyle had met only once, died unexpectedly, and before he had made provision for his wife and family. If I heard of the death, and in like sad circumstances, of an old friend, I hope I should do what was within my means to render assistance. I should not, I fear, have felt called upon to do so in the case of someone whom I had met only once. But Doyle wrote to the widow to say: 'Wills take a long time to prove'—he was aware that there was little enough to prove, and that any money advanced would in all probability never be repaid—'so please, in the meanwhile, let me be your banker for any money of which you may be in need,' or words to that effect.

In his public, that is to say, his professional life, Doyle was never once known to stoop to self-advertisement. He detested any and every form of self-advertisement by authors. Advertised, his books of course were, but only by the publishers whose legitimate business it was to make widely known the books, and the attractions of the books they were issuing. Doyle's share in the book's success was to do the best that was in him, but that done, he left the book, so far as he was concerned, to win the ear of the public wholly and solely on the merit of the work. So, too in his public life, he was the last man to advertise his own good deeds. I chanced to hear of the facts just related only because they were told to me by someone who had seen his letter. One wonders how many other instances of 'pure religion and undefiled,' how many other good deeds done the 'fatherless and widows' by Arthur Conan Doyle have gone all unrecorded.

Here is the second instance of his practical Christianity. He and I had a friend in common with whom we frequently forgathered, and invited to stay with us in our own homes. If Doyle noticed, as he could hardly help noticing, that our friend never invited either of us to his own home, nor ever spoke of his own home life, Doyle never commented on the fact to me, nor I to him. In the reader's case, if a friend imparted a confidence—by the reader that confidence would

be respected. On the other hand, if a friend withheld a confidence—from the reader his friend's wish to withhold a confidence would meet with like respect, and with no comments or inquisitive inquiries made.

One day, when the three of us were together, our friend opened his heart. 'You, Doyle, and you, Kernahan,' he said, 'must have observed that, though I have stayed under the roof of both of you, I have never invited either of you, in return, to my own home. The reason is that for years I have had a drunken wife. God only knows how desperately—if only for my children's sake—I have striven to keep my ghastly secret. But a secret, I can keep it no more. From drink she has gone—how I hate to tell it!—to vice of another sort, and notwithstanding the fact that my children were in the house at the time. For their sake—I have no choice—I must divorce her.' As briefly as possible I have told all that need, thus far, be told. Even that much I should not have felt free to tell but for the fact that in those days, the evidence in Divorce cases was reported in the newspapers, and as everybody concerned is long since dead, no pain can be given to any one.

One other matter only there is to record. The next morning I sought out this friend of both of us at his office, and while I was there a letter from Doyle was delivered. I think I can give it, word for word, so vividly is it imprinted on my memory by the circumstances:

'MY DEAR OLD —,

'Kernahan and I were shocked by what you told us to-day, and feel deeply for you. In my doctoring days, I knew of more than one case like yours, and so know too how recklessly a drunken wife squanders her husband's money. You have enough to bear as it is, for divorces are dirty businesses, and moreover, are not to be had for nothing, except, I believe, by paupers. You must at least be free from all money anxieties, so I am enclosing a cheque for £500. I should only have thrown it away on South Africans, so you need have no compunction about taking it.

'Yours ever,

'ARTHUR CONAN DOYLE.'

The recipient of that letter—I shall never forget his broken-hearted sobbing on reading it—eventually lost his reason. At no time a strong, and always a singularly sensitive man, his nerves were already shattered by shame and agony that his wife, the mother of his children, was a hopeless drunkard, and by his despairing efforts to keep so ghastly a secret from outside eyes. The publicity, to him a horror, of the Divorce proceedings did the rest, and not very long after he died in a madhouse.

I was thinking of the writer of those two letters, and of this chapter of rambling recollections, this morning, when during my before-breakfast run with my dog, I looked out towards Beachy Head. 'Just as that great headland juts out dominantly, into the sea, dwarfing its immediate surroundings,' I said to myself, 'so Conan Doyle stands out in my memory as a very Headland of Honesty and of Helpfulness to others, among some of us, his contemporaries, with our small insincerities, our small meannesses, and our small self-seekings.'

COULSON KERNAHAN.

That Strange Man upon His Cross. By Richard Roberts. (Abingdon Press. \$1.25.)

This is the substance of four lectures delivered at Yale University. Their titles are *Ecce Homo*; *The Teacher*; *The Man of Action*; *The Crucified*. Dr. Roberts is concerned with the impression Christ has made on the world, and the problem of accounting for it. Jesus was for a time primarily a teacher, circumstances turned Him into a man of action and at last brought Him to the Cross. The Gospels give us a living portrait so subtly limned that there is no serious contradiction in any part of it. After the Man we come to the Teacher and then to the Man of Action. He approached Jerusalem knowing that the stream of national religion was being poisoned at its springs. The people who had silenced Him in Galilee, He would speak to in Jerusalem. At Calvary 'the Eternal broke in upon the world in a definitive disclosure of His moral nature.' From the Cross Christ calls us to the same sublime and arduous vocation. We reach His stature by following Him in scorn of consequences. The Epilogue is as beautiful as the exposition of the four chapters.

DR. SIMON'S MASTERPIECE

John Wesley and the Religious Societies ; John Wesley and the Methodist Societies ; John Wesley and the Advance of Methodism ; John Wesley, The Master Builder ; John Wesley, The Last Phase. By John Smith Simon, D.D. (The Epworth Press. 18s. each.)

THE Preface to the first of these five volumes is dated August 1921; the second appeared in 1923; the third in 1925; the fourth in 1927. Then came an interval of seven years during which we watched Dr. Simon's 'last phase'—to use his daughter's comparison, as the boys at Jarrow who surrounded the Venerable Bede with uplifting words: 'There is yet one sentence unwritten, dearest Master.' The old scholar made a final effort; then 'all was finished.'

Dr. Simon's task was bigger than Bede's. His research stretched over more than a century; it filled 1,800 pages and represented a large part of a life of expert study. When the fifth volume was undertaken at the age of eighty-four the writer's pace began to slacken. He got almost to the death-bed of Charles Wesley, then his strength failed. On the last night of his life he told his youngest daughter that he hoped and expected her husband would finish the work. That burden was thus lifted from his mind, and three days after his ninetieth birthday he joined the company of saints and heroes among whom he had spent a large part of his life-time.

Dr. A. W. Harrison was already steeped in the subject and the MS. put into his hands needed only a few revisions before the last fifty pages were added. It was a happy thought to set his wife to write the memorial sketch of her father which crowns his great work. It is a real portrait. We watch his Scottish mother teaching him the twenty-third Psalm which her grandfather, William Saunderson, had read in 1810 in the old city of Brechin before his departure. The

venerable Methodist preacher added: 'I have endeavoured for above thirty years to keep the hour of death constantly in view that it might be as easy as going out of one room into another, and, blessed be God, I find it as easy now.' Dr. Simon told his children that he always slept on that family Psalm. His own father was a Welshman, disinherited for joining the Methodists. His death made John Smith Simon cast anchor. He was articled to a solicitor in Bristol and had crossed to the Channel Islands for the funeral. When all was over, he fell on his knees in the manse bedroom and made the great surrender.

His appointment as Dr. Jobson's assistant at City Road brought him to the house where Wesley died in 1791, and made him familiar with the leaders of Methodism, whom Dr. Jobson loved to entertain. Then he passed to Thomas Hardy's Wessex. There he stumbled on the tracks of Bartholomew and John Westley, and became steeped in questions of the Wesley ancestry. There also he fell in love with Maria Adams, daughter of a South Sea Islands missionary and niece of John Couch Adams, the discoverer of Neptune. The lines were thus laid for a life rich in joys and labours. His legal training made him an authority on all points of Methodist law and he delighted to play the part of legal adviser to the Connexion. His other role, as Methodist historian, has its abiding memorial in the five volumes at the head of this article, which will grow in value as generations turn to the origin and progress of the Evangelical Revival, and the personal labours and triumphs of England's mighty evangelist.

Dr. Simon's first volume brought out the affinities between the Religious Societies formed under Dr. Horneck and the Methodist Societies. Dr. Horneck's first rule: 'All that enter the Society shall resolve upon a holy and serious life,' strikes a familiar Methodist note, and there is a strong practical tone about the rules which embody many of the principles which guided Wesley in his long crusade against evil-living.

The chapters on Westleys and Annesleys, on the Holy Club, the Mission to Georgia and the rise of the Methodist Societies are marked by wide research and vital interest in successive stages of the early history. Wesley's conversion filled him with an insatiable desire to save the souls of men. He became an evangelist of the best type. He had also come to the conclusion that a new Society must be formed on a simple basis, a Society whose supreme business was to 'spread Scriptural holiness over the land.'

The second volume describes the extraordinary progress made in the seven years that followed the separation from the Society in Fetter Lane. The period was one of the most formative in Methodist history. Providence manifestly had its plan for a great awakening, and Wesley was its fit instrument, 'blest' as was manifest, to John Gambold, even in Oxford, 'with such activity as to be always gaining ground and such steadiness that he lost none.'

Charles Wesley in these early days was also a mighty field-preacher, who feared no mob, and put his whole soul into promoting the great revival. He had a double ministry, for his hymns touched the hearts of the vast congregations, and bore fruits of penitence, and scattered clouds of spiritual darkness long after the preacher's voice was silent. Nor was George Whitefield less mighty. He led the way to the brothers in field-preaching and gained the ear of the multitude in all parts of the country. Calvinism eventually separated him from the Wesleys, but he loved them and delighted in them to the close of his marvellous ministry. It is a great sight. The three geniuses of oratory, of praise and of organization, knit together and mightily used of God for the salvation of two continents and indeed of the whole world.

John Wesley continued to fascinate Dr. Simon and his third volume fills the ten eventful years from January 13, 1747, when he rode into the Devizes, to 1756, when his brother practically ceased to be an itinerant evangelist. John Wesley, aided by his brother, and a noble band of preachers

—and workers—had built up the Societies into an invincible unity by his counsel, example, and influence, during the years 1739 to 1746. The next ten years were a period of unceasing labour and notable advance. The prevailing idea that Wesley was a man of extraordinary physical strength must be laid aside. He did his wonderful work in spite of constantly recurring feebleness. The Rev. Richard Buttermworth found notices of sixty-nine attacks of sickness in the diaries and *Journal* from 1739 to 1790. That adds to our amazement at his unwearying labours and makes it more and more evident that he was a chosen vessel for the evangelization of the Three Kingdoms. Charles Wesley's marriage and his brother's loss of Grace Murray give vivid interest to many pages of this third volume. Its successor brings us into the presence of *Wesley, the Master Builder*. His sphere of influence expanded to America and Dr. Simon gives special attention to the introduction of Methodism into the American Colonies. The relation of the Societies to the Church of England, the employment of lay preachers, and the rift caused by Thomas Maxfield and George Bell, gave Wesley more care and trouble in six months than in many years past. 1763 was 'the year of the great forsaking.' Wesley kept 'a lonely vigil.' He tells Lady Huntingdon on April 7, 1763: 'By the mercy of God I am still alive, and following the work to which He has called me, although without any help, even in the most trying times, from those of whom I might have expected it.' His courage did not fail and a signal reward came in 1769, when Richard Boardman and Joseph Pilmoor sailed for New York, and Methodism began its glorious service in that vast continent. Before the year closed the *Journal* notes that 'both in New York and Philadelphia multitudes flock to hear and behave with the deepest seriousness; and the Society in each place already contains above a hundred members.' Nine months later George Whitefield died at Newbury Port. Wesley preached his funeral sermon at the chapel in Tottenham Court Road

when 'an immense multitude was gathered together from all corners of the town.' It was a memorable occasion, which made Wesley trust that 'God has given a blow to that bigotry which has prevailed for many years.' That happy issue was delayed by the attack on the doctrinal Minutes of 1770, but John Fletcher's masterly defence of Wesley's position turned even this crisis into a new era of blessing. Charles Wesley also came to live in Marylebone, and as the period closed 'the work for which Wesley lived was prospering. The boundaries of the field were extended, and from almost every part there came the songs of harvest.'

Vol. V. *The Last Phase* opens in 1773, when Wesley felt it necessary to make provision for the future government of the Methodist Societies. Circumstances made it clear that his dream of a Methodist Society incorporated with the Church of England would not be realized, and he wrote a strong appeal to John Fletcher to 'come and strengthen the hands, comfort the heart, and share the labour' of his affectionate friend and brother. Fletcher replied that he could not leave Madeley 'without a fuller persuasion that the time is come,' and Wesley was obliged to wait. The needs of America were absorbing much of his attention. Returns for 1761 show that of the white population, 293,000 belonged to the Church of England, 851,000 to other religious denominations. A few years later political events were seriously to diminish the hold of the Church of England. The moral condition of many of the clergy also had its influence. Bishop Samuel Wilberforce says that in the State of Maryland 'the scandal of ill-living clergymen had risen to a fearful height.' Wesley was slow to move, but events were gradually leading the way towards the ordinations of 1784. Meanwhile his hands were full of work at home. Joseph Benson, who was much in his company at Edinburgh in 1774, was more than ever persuaded that he was 'a none such. I know not his fellow, first, for abilities, natural and acquired; and secondly for his incomparable diligence in the application of those abilities

to the best of employments. His lively fancy, tenacious memory, clear understanding, ready elocution, manly courage, indefatigable industry, really amaze me.'

The outbreak of war with America in 1775 plunged Wesley into stormy seas. He was strongly opposed to the appeal to arms, and in a letter to Lord North, on June 15, 1775, he asks 'Are we then able to conquer the Americans, suppose they are left to themselves' by our enemies in Europe? It is a noble plea for peace. His *Calm Address to our American Colonies* was modified through a change in his attitude towards the conflict due to Dr. Johnson's *Taxation no Tyranny*. The change brought severe attacks from the partisans of America, but John Fletcher made a convincing reply to these critics.

The need for an ordained ministry was growing more urgent every year, and John Fletcher sent Wesley a plan for the formation of 'the growing body of Methodists in Great Britain, Ireland, and America into a General Society—a daughter of our holy Mother.' It was to recede from the Church of England in nothing but some palpable defects, about doctrine, discipline, and unevangelical hierarchy. The bishops were to be asked to ordain the Methodist preachers who passed the required examinations, and thus 'the Methodist Church of England' was to be formed. Then Fletcher suggested that if the bishops declined the request, 'Messrs. Wesley will be obliged to take an irregular (and not unevangelical) step to ordain upon a Church of England independent plan such lay preachers as shall appear to them qualified for holy orders.' Dr. Simon thinks that Wesley had discussed the problem of ordination with Fletcher, and that the suggestion as to ordination by presbyters may have had weight when the time came to adopt it, in 1784.

The chapter on Mrs. John Wesley deals wisely with the bitterest trial of Wesley's life, and it is a relief to watch the building of the City Road Chapel, which gave Methodism worthy headquarters in London, and to see how Dr. Coke threw in his lot with Wesley in 1777 and became the leader

of its missionary expansion. 1784 saw the ordinations for America which had long been an urgent necessity. The Methodists there had no one to administer the sacraments or baptize their children. All Wesley's efforts to persuade the Bishop of London to rise to the occasion proved vain. He therefore took action himself, and in September 1784, with the help of Mr. Creighton, a clergyman who assisted him in London, he set apart Dr. Coke, as Superintendent of the Methodist Church in America, and with his help and Coke's ordained Richard Whatcoat and Thomas Vasey as presbyters. When they reached America Francis Asbury was to be ordained as Coke's colleague. Dr. Simon gives a full account of the ordinations and the gradual growth of Wesley's conviction as to his right to ordain.

Still earlier, on February 28, 1784, the Deed of Declaration was signed which vested the rights of Conference, after the death of the Wesleys, in a hundred ministers named therein. Wesley met the fears of some of the preachers, who thought the deed would exclude them from certain rights and privileges which they had enjoyed, by a letter to be read to the Legal Conference after his death. In this he besought them to assume no superiority over their brethren, but to let all things go on as when he was with them. That appeal was nobly observed for 148 years till Methodist Union brought in a new order.

The Chapter on 'The Methodist Episcopal Church' gives an impressive account of the ordination of Asbury and the first General Conference held in America. Wesley's last years were a noble close to his noble record. Vincent Perronet, his much loved and trusted counsellor, died on May 9, 1785; John Fletcher followed him on August 14, 1785. Charles Wesley died on March 29, 1788. His brother's labours were unremitting, and his appearances in all parts of the country were public ovations.

Dr. Simon laid down his pen in the middle of Chapter XXII. His son-in-law found that the scrupulous care he had

given to the earlier volumes had marked the 300 pages of the last. He had to follow the Triumphal Progress of these years when the scandal of the Cross had ceased, to describe the problems and difficulties which he still had to face and to describe the last scenes at City Road, when the long life of apostolic devotion closed with the smile of earth and heaven. His concluding estimate and, indeed, all his added pages, would have been endorsed by Dr. Simon: 'Esteem for the purity of his motives and the complete devotion of his life grows with the years. . . . The master autocracy is blended with paternal affection and humane consideration for all his children.' His preachers 'were for the most part men of strong common sense and sturdy individuality. Only the great qualities of a Wesley could have commanded such implicit obedience and such whole-hearted support. We may disagree with many of his opinions, and smile at some of his eccentricities, but it is very difficult to discover real blemishes of character in the man. . . . His shrewd, practical mind lives in the wonderful organization of world-wide Methodism to-day, but the soul of the loyal disciple of his Lord is greater than any contribution he may have made to Church Government. In the fellowship of the Saints he is in the best company that we can know.'

JOHN TELFORD, B.A.

Zachary Macaulay. An Appreciation by Charles Z. M. Booth. (Longmans & Co. 6s.). At the age of seventeen Zachary Macaulay was Under-Manager and Book-keeper on a Sugar Plantation in Jamaica where he revolted from the punishments inflicted on the slaves. He became steeled to the barbarities but was recalled to London just as he had completed his twenty-first year. His experience had fitted him for his great share in the Anti-Slavery Cause and he became Wilberforce's unseen ally and the acknowledged leader, outside Parliament, of the Cause. 'For ten years he bullied the bullies; for ten years, with sickening reiteration, he knuckled the conscience of England, until frayed nerves could stand no more.' He became *the* authority on the slave trade and was the only one of the Saints whom the Duke of Wellington liked.

THE PUNS IN MILTON

NOTHING in Milton is more frequently ridiculed than his habit of playing on words, and especially the feeble equivoques which he puts into the mouths of the triumphant devils in the Sixth Book of *Paradise Lost*. As, in his controversy with More, he could not resist the temptation to utilize the fact that *morus* means a mulberry, so, it is held, in this and many other passages of his poetry, a casual similarity of words lures him on to destruction. Next to the fact that he was a Puritan, and that from a Puritan true wit can no more proceed than a good thing can come out of Nazareth, it is these puns that have exposed Milton to the charge that he had no sense of humour.

The attack began early—almost as soon, be it noted, as the attack upon the ‘clenches’ of Shakespeare and Ben Jonson, on which Dryden was so severe. The ‘classicists’ of the Restoration and Revolution times did not like puns, and the dislike was fully formulated and clearly expressed by Addison, the very glass of early eighteenth-century fashion, in the famous essay on Milton which appeared in the *Spectator*, every Saturday, for several successive weeks in 1712. Addison censured individually and generally such plays as ‘at one slight bound high overleaped all bound,’ ‘tempted our attempt,’ ‘that small infantry warred on by cranes,’ ‘brought into our world a world of woe,’ ‘beseeching or besieging’; but he reserved his chief blame for the jests of the derisive Satan and the gamesome Belial. He would, in fact, scarcely allow the epic poet to deviate into any form of pleasantry; the epic theme is lofty, and the style must, almost uniformly, correspond with it. Virgil, he says, has but one pleasantry in the whole *Aeneid*, and that in the description of athletic sports, where, if anywhere, it may be pardoned. Homer is in this respect less perfect; he is sometimes not merely ‘pleasant,’ but mean and vulgar, as

in the story of Mars and Venus, or in the character of Thersites. Milton very seldom falls below the due level, but once or twice he errs, and shows himself, to the detriment of his art, more Homeric than Virgilian. There is a pleasantry in *Paradise Lost* where the evil spirits are described as rallying the angels upon the success of their new-contrived artillery. 'This passage,' says Addison, 'I look upon to be the most exceptionable in the whole poem, as being nothing else but a string of puns, and those too very indifferent ones.' He then gives the whole passage:

Leader, the terms we sent were terms of weight,
Of hard contents, and full of force urged home,

and the rest of the familiar sarcasms; and it is plain that he expected all his 'polite' readers to agree with him. A few years later, the same tale is told. It is this same passage that Pope is thinking of in his famous lines:

Milton's strong pinion now not heaven can bound,
Now, serpentlike, in prose he sweeps the ground;
In quibbles angels and archangels join,
And God the Father turns a school-divine.¹

And the feeling has been expressed more or less freely from that day to this. 'Milton's play on words,' says Johnson, 'in which he delights too often; his equivocations, which Bentley endeavours to defend by the example of the ancients, it is not necessary to mention, because they are easily remarked and generally censured'; but later critics have found it necessary to mention them, and have made their easy remarks. Pattison, Stopford Brooke, Raleigh, and in fact almost everybody, whether on the whole favourable to Milton or not, follow in the same path. I shall therefore have some strong feelings to contend with when I venture to offer some words in defence, and shall run the terrible risk of being myself exposed to the charge of want of humour. But I

¹ Pope is also thinking of the description, in the Tenth Book, of the sudden change of Satan and his angels into hissing serpents—a description on which I shall have something to say in a moment.

shall make the attempt none the less, even though it be a forlorn hope, and even though my personal taste agrees with that of the counsel for the prosecution. With two or three exceptions, I myself dislike Milton's puns; but it is the duty of a critic not merely to express his own likes or dislikes, but to consider 'faults' or 'beauties' in the light of the times, the circumstances, and the general atmosphere in which the writer lived. I do not think it necessary, in dealing with Milton or any poet, to do as the old critic bade the readers of Euripides do—study him till they loved and admired his very faults—but I do hold that no poet can be duly appreciated until both his faults and his virtues are seen in due perspective.

First, then, we may, I think, rule out, in our judgement of Milton himself, the whole of that jesting dialogue between Satan and Belial, and so at a single blow destroy the chief stronghold of the enemy. Milton is here hinting at what is coming afterwards, and giving us the first sign of that degradation which is to befall Satan and his followers. To exhibit this progressive degradation is one main purpose of the plot of *Paradise Lost*: Satan, who appears at first as not less than 'archangel ruined,' is to be marked as 'heaping on himself damnation' by reiterated crimes, the worst of which is the malicious and unprovoked attack upon mankind. The rebellion in heaven, though a crime, is not an absolutely damning and contemptible crime. It is to Satan what the murder of Duncan is to Macbeth, the first step—bad, but intelligible. The destruction of Adam and Eve is like the murder of Banquo, utterly shameless, disgraceful, and sordid; and it is visited with the appropriate penalty. Hell is low enough, but this is the still lower hell, gaping to devour. Rightly is the ruined archangel, now a veritable devil, punished at the end, when, triumphantly boasting of his success, he sees himself and his followers transformed into crawling and hissing serpents. So, on the heavenly battlefield, in a similar moment of apparent success, his real failure is marked by visible *mental* degradation; the lofty and

magnificent rebel, whose mind had dealt only in the greatest ideas—whose sins had been the lofty ones of pride and ambition—now delights in the most trivial things. Viewed in this aspect, these contemptible puns are as clear a foreboding of future ignominy as the doubts of Romeo are a foreboding of the ensuing tragedy, or Antonio's sadness a premonition of the disasters that are to follow. Milton *despises* the self-glorifying demon, and reveals his contempt by making him utter contemptible words. There is no more reason to think that Milton admired the puns *in themselves* than that we ourselves admire them: but *in their setting* they have point. The French critics objected to the opening scene of *Romeo and Juliet* because of the bad puns in it. Macaulay's answer, whether conclusive in that particular instance or not, may be applied here: 'It is bad joking, but in character. The puns are not Shakespeare's, but Sampson's and Gregory's.' The answer is conclusive against those who censure Milton for the jests of Belial. How could he better show what he felt about that 'fleshly incubus' than by putting such words into his mouth? As well say Dante was vulgar and gross because he ascribes to the loathsome Scarmiglione filthy and hateful acts and language, as make Milton responsible for words he gives to Belial.

If this conjecture be sound, we have to test this famous passage from the point of view of its *dramatic* propriety. Are the words unsuitable to *Satan* and *Belial*, their characters being what they were, and the circumstances being such as Milton describes them? The rebellious angels have already been shown as without forethought or a sense of possibilities, by the mere fact that they have declared war against omnipotence. A trifling success is sufficient, shortly afterwards, to induce in them a boastful confidence: and that confidence leads to the sort of thing which Virgil ascribes to the thrasonical Dares, just before his defeat by Entellus. The demons are losing their power to see realities, and they show this by forgetting their former lofty dialect.

I now pass to the equivoques which cannot be denied to be Milton's own. These, though as a rule better than those he gives to his devils, and though one or two are such as add real force and beauty to their surroundings, are to the modern mind, as to the eighteenth-century mind, in the main objectionable. Nevertheless, it is our business to endeavour to see them not with our own eyes but with those of Milton's contemporaries and models; to understand them before we blame them, and to hear before we strike. Nor have we far to go. As we have already seen, Bentley defended them by the example of the ancients; nor does it need the scholarship of a Bentley to find plenty of ancient precedent by which Milton may well have been guided, or, if we will, misled. Addison himself owned the existence of these precedents, while refusing to respect them. 'I know,' says he, 'there are figures for this kind of speech, that some of the greatest ancients have been guilty of it, and that Aristotle himself has given it a place in his *Rhetoric* among the beauties of that art.' Now Milton, as indeed we could guess from *Paradise Lost* alone, was a close student of the *Rhetoric*; and, in his *Tractate on Education*, he sets it down along with the works of Plato, Cicero, and Longinus, as one of the books to be read by advanced pupils in his ideal school. He must have been perfectly familiar with what Aristotle says about plays on words and names, and would recall without effort that Herodicus had called Polus a 'colt' by name and a colt by nature; that a playwright had spoken of Pentheus, with a reference to *penthos*, grief, as

Pentheus, with name prophetic of his doom;

or that the laws of Draco had been described, because of their cruelty, as 'a dragon's code.'¹ If Aristotle approved of the saying of Isocrates, that the *archē* or empire of Athens was the *archē* or beginning of her ruin,² it is pretty certain that Milton with his profound admiration of the Stagirite,

¹ *Rhetoric*, II. 23, 28.

² *Rhetoric*, III. 11, 7.

would approve also. He who in Samson imitated so closely Aristotle's ideal of a tragedy, would imitate him here. He is said to have known Homer by heart; if so, he would not miss, nor fail to admire, those Homeric puns to which Addison found occasion to draw attention. Nor, appreciating Cicero, can he have forgotten that among the '*lumina et insignia*' of style, Cicero introduces the duplication and repetition of words, and *verba leviter commutata*, which he illustrates by quoting Cato's '*nobiliorem mobiliorem*,'¹ and of which indeed there are perhaps too many instances in his own speeches.² If, then, classical authority can justify the use of the pun, Milton had plenty to excuse him.

But this is far from all. Milton's models were not merely the Latin and Greek classics, but even more decidedly the Hebrew Scriptures. That he was a good Hebrew scholar has been repeatedly shown; by A. B. Davidson in response to a request from David Masson, and by Israel Abrahams in an article on the Translation of the Psalms. 'On the whole,' says Abrahams, 'it is quite clear that Milton read Hebrew with minute precision. To see how just this verdict is, compare his exactness with the erratic and slovenly transliterations of Edmund Chilmead. The great Puritan poet drew at least some of his inspiration from the pure well of Hebrew undefiled.'³ The *poetical* worth of his version may not be great; as Landor said: 'Milton was never so

¹ *The Orator*, sect. 135.

² Take, for example, the famous '*altercatio*' with Clodius (*Ad Atticum*, I. 16): 'You call me Rex, a king; but your brother-in-law Rex, from whom you expected a legacy, never mentioned you in his will.' (The same pun forms the gist of Horace's seventh satire.) 'The jury,' replied Clodius, 'did not trust you though you were on oath.' 'Twenty-five of them *did* trust me,' answered Cicero; 'but the other thirty-one would not *trust* you, for they insisted on having their bribes beforehand.' These puns are as bad as any in Milton. I am practically certain that both Aristotle and Cicero would have been loud in their praises of 'beseeching or besieging,' if not of some others of Milton's puns. Even for More and Morus Milton had the precedent of Cicero's jests on Verres, whose name means *pig*.

³ Abrahams, *The Book of Delight*, p. 247; cp. p. 312.

much a regicide as when he lifted up his hand and smote King David'; but it is accurate.

Milton, then, was a Hebrew scholar; and even when blind he had a chapter of the Hebrew Bible read to him every morning. He cannot, it is plain, have passed over the paronomasias with which the Old Testament is crowded; and, if they strike us, they must have struck him far more powerfully, for they were to him the very words of God; they were 'laboured with the pencil of the Holy Ghost.' With such an *imprimatur* how could he hesitate? What God had cleansed, that he would not call common; and if Isaiah, after his lips had been touched with the live coal from off the altar, had been allowed, nay commanded, to pun on *pachad* and *pachath*, who was Milton that he should refuse to follow the sublime example? Nay, Christ himself had played with the name Peter; it was all but the duty of his servant to tread the same path, even if *non passibus aequis*.¹ With such a precedent, he would feel that the quibble was not to be confined to arguments with More and Salmasius, or to cheery epitaphs on a Cambridge carrier, but ought, on due occasion, to be used in the service, and for the honour, of God.

But there is yet more. We are apt to forget that Milton was brought up in the Jacobean age, and that Elizabethan memories were around the growing boy. Shakespeare was hardly dead when he went to school, and Jonson's learned sock was still on when he was at the University. He himself, in his public 'Vacation Exercise,' had been expected, in accordance with old custom, to pun on the names of his college companions, and, as Masson and W. G. Clark have shown, he obeyed the prescription. What Bacon did on the woolsack, he did on the University stage; he quibbled, poorly it is true, but in the fashionable manner. He could

¹ Milton, of course, did not know that this was but one of a hundred of Christ's paronomasias; but if he had been told, he would not have been surprised.

not, with all his proud independence, escape the spirit of his time; and the spirit of his time was a quibbling spirit. He delivered himself from it at last—there are no quibbles in *Samson Agonistes*—but it was slow to leave him, and, like the demon in the Gospels, tore him badly in coming forth.

He was a Puritan, but in this respect Puritan and Cavalier were one. Milton, in fact, quibbles less often than Cartwright, and far less often, if far less amusingly, than Fuller, whose puns are innumerable if almost always delightful. Nor were the Catholics less inveterate punsters than Anglicans, Presbyterians, or Independents. Crashaw practised the art, and the Jesuits and the preaching Orders were not behindhand. This is a trait admirably caught by Schiller in his *Wallensteins Lager*, where the Capuchin—drawn, as is well known, from history—points half his denunciations with puns none the less effective because ridiculously bad:

Das römische Reich—das Gott erbarm!
Sollte jetzt heissen römisch Arm;
Der Rheinstrom ist worden zu einem Peinstrom,
Die Klöster sind ausgenommene Nester,
Die Bistümer sind verwandelt in Wüsttümer,
Und alle die gesegneten deutschen Länder
Sind verkehrt worden in Elender.¹

When then every religious denomination, every country in Europe, and nearly all literature and rhetoric, was given over to punning, and when, besides, Milton found example for it in classical poetry, in classical criticism, and even in Holy Writ, there is more reason to wonder that he did not give us more of it than that he gave us so much.

E. E. KELLETT, M.A.

¹ Coleridge, not unnaturally, declined the task of translating the *Lager*. I may render the puns by English ones not much worse than those of the original: The Holy Roman Empire is all in holes, the Rhine has begun to pine, the cloisters are given over to Royster-Doysters, every diocese will speedily die or cease, and every acre in Blessed Germany has started aching.

THE PROBLEM OF THE FOURTH GOSPEL

THE problem presented by the Fourth Gospel is one of great complexity. No subject, perhaps, in the range of New Testament literature, has excited so much interest and controversy. So conservative a scholar as Dr. Salmon modified his judgement of it towards the end of his life, and expressed his belief that the author of the Gospel was not John the Apostle, but an assistant. This is significant of the great change which has taken place within the last few years with reference to the Johannine problem. It is probably right to say that by most modern scholars the Apostolic authorship is given up; though there are still those who maintain the traditional view.

There are facts which make it exceedingly difficult, if not impossible, to believe that the Gospel, as it stands, could have been the work of John the Apostle. Arguments from silence are perilous, but the Apostle would scarcely have ignored such events as the Transfiguration and the Last Supper, in which he had a prominent part; nor would he have depended upon the Synoptics where his own personal recollections would have served him. It is needless to point out other striking features of the Gospel, such as concern the character of our Lord's teaching, the length and the place of His ministry.

That there is a problem, and a very complex and difficult one, is admitted. It is not made any easier by the existence of the three Epistles and of the Apocalypse, which, traditionally, are ascribed to the same author. Unfortunately, there is a strange lack of definite information about these Johannine writings; very early there are hints of doubt, and even contradictory statements, which make it difficult, if not impossible, to get at the plain truth. Certain critical writers, such as Martineau, represent the Gospel as a late work, and place it somewhere about the middle of the second century.

Harnack, whose knowledge of early Christian documents is unrivalled, dates it between A.D. 80-110. Dr. Burney—supreme among Aramaic scholars—places it A.D. 75-80. In view of this, it might be useful to give the reasons, in brief, why this early date appears to be right.

The documents likely to be helpful in the investigation are few, and there is sharp division as to the value of their testimony. Ignatius, on his way to martyrdom (A.D. 107-116), wrote seven letters to the Churches of Asia Minor. They are mentioned by Eusebius, and he gives extracts from them. A careful examination of these epistles, whilst it yields little in the way of direct quotation, reveals a mind which is saturated with the Johannine theology: e.g., 'I desire the bread of God, which is the flesh of Jesus Christ . . . and desire the drink of God which is His blood,' suggests John iv and vi. 'He is the door of the Father,' suggests John x. It is difficult to resist the conclusion that he had some knowledge of the Fourth Gospel. Dr. Sanday says (*Criticism of the Fourth Gospel*): 'Ignatius seems to reflect the Johannine teaching with extraordinary fidelity.'

In the Didache, or Teaching of the twelve Apostles, the date of which can scarcely be later than A.D. 120, there are some reflections of Johannine thought, perhaps the most pronounced being the reference to Christ as the Vine, (cp. John xv).

In the Epistle of Clement to the Corinthians (A.D. 97), the authenticity of which is well established, there is some evidence of acquaintance with Johannine teaching: e.g., 'Blessed are we beloved if we keep the commandments of God in the harmony of love'; (cp. John xiv. v. 15). 'Let us look steadfastly to the blood of Christ' (cp. John i. v. 29).

Again, the Epistle of Diognetus (A.D. 110-117) contains a few evident quotations from the Gospel: e.g., 'Christians dwell in the world yet are not of the world,' (cp. John xvii.). As the two concluding chapters are suspected to be spurious, we cannot, perhaps, attach much weight to its testimony.

Thus it is extremely probable, allowing time for its circulation, that the Fourth Gospel was in existence before, or at the close of, the first century.

There is also internal evidence for an early date of the Gospel. We might well agree with Burney in fixing upon A.D. 75. For we cannot read this Gospel without the strong impression that its presentation of the Christ and of His teaching cannot be far removed, in date, from the Pauline teaching, which was current in the Church, notably in reference to the deity of our Lord and to the Holy Spirit. The temple was destroyed A.D. 70: the motive for such a portraiture of Christ within a few years afterwards would seem to us to be a strong one. Again, we note the complete absence from the Gospel of all reference to the errors of the Gnosticism appearing in the early part of the second century. The only reference seems to be to that earlier Gnostic system with which Cerinthus was identified, in which our Lord's true humanity was questioned, and which appeared about A.D. 75; indeed a popular tradition sprang up early that the Gospel was written by the Apostle John himself to combat this heresy. It is probable, therefore, that the date of the Gospel is somewhere between A.D. 75-80.

The next step is to examine the traditions of its authorship by John the Apostle. There are two sets of traditions: on the one hand, that the Apostle lived to a great age in Ephesus, as its bishop; on the other hand, that he suffered an early martyrdom between A.D. 62-66. Let us examine these traditions, and state the conclusions to which we are led.

First, Eusebius (*Ecclesiastical History*) records the testimony of Irenaeus that the Church in Ephesus was founded by Paul, and that John the Apostle continued to abide there until the times of Trajan (A.D. 98). This appears to be the first and the main tradition for the Ephesian residence. Eusebius also quotes the letter of Irenaeus to Florinus, in which he (Irenaeus) recalls his meeting with, and knowledge,

—as a boy—of Polycarp in Lower Asia: 'I can recall,' (says Irenaeus), 'the very place where Polycarp was accustomed to sit and discourse . . . and his familiar intercourse with John,' &c. John, Polycarp, Irenaeus—the link seems strong and impressive. Now these statements of Irenaeus are of extreme importance, as they undoubtedly support the tradition of the Apostle's residence in Ephesus, and his extreme old age.

When the following facts, however, are borne in mind, the testimony of Irenaeus is exceedingly doubtful. Ignatius wrote an Epistle to the Ephesians within, at most, twenty years of the supposed bishopric of the Apostle at Ephesus, and there is no reference to it. It is almost incredible that Ignatius would have passed over such a fact in complete silence. Polycarp's Epistle to the Philippians, written about the middle of the second century, makes not a single allusion to it. If Polycarp was the disciple of the Apostle John, it is incredible that he should never speak of his master nor quote him. On the whole, it is most probable that Irenaeus, in his letter to Florinus, referred to John the Presbyter, who lived at the close of the first century. Irenaeus was capable of such a mistake as this, for he asserts that Jesus was crucified in the reign of Claudius, when He was nearly fifty years of age. He makes other serious misstatements.

The only other testimony of importance to the Ephesian residence is found in the Epistle of Polycrates, bishop of Ephesus, *circa* A.D. 190, to Victor, bishop of Rome. It is as follows: 'Moreover John that rested on the bosom of the Lord, who was a priest that bore the πέταλον (sacerdotal plate), and martyr and teacher: he also rests at Ephesus.' Now it is difficult, if not impossible, to see in this priest and teacher any resemblance to the Apostle John, though it is probable, as Moffatt points out, that John the Presbyter may be referred to. For these reasons, we reject the tradition that John the Apostle lived to extreme old age in Ephesus, and died there.

But we have now to examine the evidence for the early martyrdom of the Apostle somewhere between A.D. 62-66. Let it be noted, first, that it is a fact in favour of the early martyrdom that in two of the Gospels, Mark and Matthew, it seems to be referred to by our Lord Himself: 'The cup which I drink ye shall drink,' &c. That James and John, the sons of Zebedee, were to suffer martyrdom is a plain inference from these words.

In a manuscript of Georgius Hamartolus (George the Sinner), dated the ninth century, Papias is quoted as saying, in the second book of his Expositions, that John the Apostle suffered martyrdom after writing his Gospel. Nor does this testimony stand alone. A fragment (known as the De Boor fragment), from the fifth-century Chronicle of Philip of Side, has been found, in which Papias is again quoted as saying, in the same Expositions, that 'John the Divine and James his brother were killed by the Jews.' Attempts have been made to refer these words to John the Baptist and James the brother of our Lord, but such a collocation of names is extremely improbable. Now it is very difficult to see how these two statements could have been made, apart from some real basis in Papias. It is true they are not to be found in Eusebius, and that we must conclude he overlooked them. Eusebius overlooked many things, and sometimes valuable references are tantalizingly short. Laylor (*Eusebiana*) has pointed out that the method employed by Eusebius of using volumes of tracts, and using them sometimes in a rather perfunctory manner, would account not only for the lack of chronological order in the statement of events, but also for omissions. Moffatt (*Literature of the New Testament*) does not hesitate to say: 'It is indubitable that the work of Papias must have contained some statements of this nature about the two sons of Zebedee,' and he draws attention to the fact that some ancient Calendars, East and West, support this witness to the early martyrdom of James and John.

Perhaps there is no testimony bearing upon the problem before us that has been subjected to closer scrutiny than this concerning the Apostle's early martyrdom. It is, of course, opposed to widely received tradition, and somewhat startling in its character. We can no longer think of John surviving until nearly a hundred years of age, and dying in Ephesus. He dies between A.D. 62-66 in Jerusalem. The belief alters our entire perspective. That John's banishment to Patmos was a drinking of the cup of the Lord—the view maintained by Origen in his Commentary upon the passage Matt. xx. v. 23—seems to us to be unlikely; nor do we see the improbability that Papias should have made the statement attributed to him, which two independent authors could scarcely have invented. The strong impression left upon the unprejudiced mind, after careful weighing of the evidence, is that the early martyrdom can be established with reasonable certainty. We conclude, then, that John the Apostle was martyred between A.D. 62-66. Polycarp cannot have known him personally; since his (Polycarp's) death took place A.D. 155, at the age of 86, he was born A.D. 69, too late to have personal contact with him.

We shall now proceed to inquire into the authorship of the Gospel. Many theories as to its composition have been proposed. It is evident that the Gospel closes with the last verses of Chapter xx: 'But many other signs did Jesus . . . but these are written that ye may believe . . .' Chapter xxi is manifestly an addition by one whose aim is, at the close, to ascribe the entire Gospel to the beloved disciple: 'This is the disciple which beareth witness of these things and wrote these things and we know that his witness is true.' Nowhere in the Gospel is the Apostle John himself named as the author, though some references to the 'beloved disciple' connect him with it. If it had not been for these references, the Johannine authorship might never have been held at all.

It is here that the Fourth Gospel parts company with

the Apocalypse, in which there is no concealing of the author's identity. 'I, John, your brother and partaker with you in the tribulation and kingdom and patience which are in Jesus' &c. Here the authorship of John is affirmed. It is well nigh impossible to believe, for this reason alone, that the anonymous Fourth Gospel is by the same hand as the Apocalypse. Again, the Greek of the Apocalypse is not that of the Gospel. Dionysius (A.D. 250), who seems strangely to have anticipated modern criticism, speaks of the difficulty he had himself over the belief that the Apocalypse and the Fourth Gospel were written by the Apostle. He refers to the barbarous Greek of the Apocalypse, hints at the hand in it of John Mark, and concludes that it may have been the work of 'some John but not the Apostle.' Probably it was the work of John the Presbyter, together with the second and third Epistles: these three books show signs of common authorship, whilst the first Epistle seems, on linguistic grounds, inseparably connected with the Fourth Gospel.

But, to return, the external and internal evidence lead us to the conclusion that John the Apostle cannot be regarded as the author of the Gospel. The question 'who did write it?' must remain open, or at best conjectural. Accepting the early martyrdom of the Apostle in Jerusalem A.D. 62-66 and the date of the Gospel as A.D. 75-80, we feel the force of certain considerations arising from a study of the Gospel itself. The contents show some dependence at least upon Mark, the date of which cannot be later than A.D. 65. It is probable that between this date and A.D. 80 the Gospel was composed and made its appearance. We conjecture that the Apostle John, not long before his martyrdom, wrote down some of his memories of the Lord's life, and that such writing passed into the hands of one of his disciples. This disciple was a Greek-speaking Jew, familiar with Palestine, and especially with Jerusalem. Further, he was a theologian, a mystic, and an idealist, who used his materials

freely, and occasionally drew from the fountain of oral tradition concerning our Lord's life and teaching. He may have written the Gospel in stages, at various intervals of time, until the completed work was submitted to another disciple, or school of disciples, who acted the part of editor, adding Chapter xxi and some other touches. The writer of the Gospel, fusing together the various materials that came to him, in the crucible of his own devout and divinely illuminated mind, had a purpose. A form of Gnostic Christology made its appearance in the first century which was identified with Cerinthus. Through Epiphanius, some conflicting accounts have come down to us concerning this system; but that it separated between Jesus and the Christ, and tended to the denial of our Lord's true humanity, seems to be evident. This would, in part, account for the emphasis noticeable in the Gospel and in the First Epistle upon the union of Christ's humanity and divinity. But more than this can be said of the writer of this Gospel. It is only as you read it, and feel its power over you, that you perceive its message is for all time: to the end that the risen and glorified Christ may dwell in the heart by faith, spiritually present with His Church for ever.

It is in vain we try to fix the identity of the writer. Prof. W. F. Howard, (*The Fourth Gospel in Recent Criticism and Interpretation*) says: 'We shall never know who wrote this Gospel . . . but behind the writer there stood the figure of one who had not only heard Jesus . . . but had also lived with Him and entered into His ways of thought.' Whoever he was, he had something of the mind of 'the beloved disciple,' and was in a position of privileged access to material of a historical character, here and there even superior to the synoptic tradition. This is so in the narrative of the Passion. There is good reason for believing that the crucifixion of our Lord was on the day of the Passover, even though the synoptists identify the Supper with the Passover. Finally, it has been conjectured that the Gospel was written upon

sheets which were, before long, displaced; and Moffatt (*Translation of the New Testament*) with others, notably F. Warburton Lewis, by careful efforts to find a true order in the narrative, have brought the Lord's Ministry into closer harmony with the records of the synoptists.

It remains for us to add a few words with respect to John the Presbyter. The second and the third Epistles of John begin, unlike the first Epistle: 'The elder unto the elect lady and her children'; 'The elder unto Gaius the beloved.' The passage quoted from Papias by Eusebius, in which two Johns are mentioned, is well known. The probability is, that Papias intended to distinguish between John the Apostle and John the Presbyter, and this is the view of Eusebius himself. It is to be presumed that the Presbyter was still living when Papias wrote (A.D. 145). Can we learn what was the year of his birth? Polycarp passed on his memories of the Presbyter to Irenaeus who was a boy *παῖς* —but a 'boy' would be well over twenty years old in the times we are discussing. The year of the birth of Irenaeus has been fixed at A.D. 130. He must have come into contact with Polycarp about A.D. 150. As John the Presbyter had died before this date, it furnishes us with the *terminus ad quem* of his life. To fix the *terminus a quo* is difficult. We believe that he wrote the book of Revelation, which appeared in the reign of Domitian, who died A.D. 96. What age was the Presbyter then? Presumably not less than thirty years, though he may well have been older. If born in the year A.D. 62 (say) he would have been 83 years old in the time of Papias. That John the Presbyter could have known John the Apostle is, therefore, extremely improbable, unless we make him an exceedingly old man.

T. ARTHUR BAILEY, M.A., B.D.

THE IDEA OF FATE IN ANCIENT GREEK LITERATURE

*But my fate, on some throbbing wheel of God,
Always must rise or fall, and change its being.*¹

IF we wish to trace the Greek conception of Fate back to its earliest source, we are obliged to revert in thought to a time when men first began to speculate on the 'causes of things.' Although Thales of Miletus is usually credited with being the first scientist, long before his time men had framed a hypothesis to account for the manifold events and experiences that make up human life. For the evidence let us turn to the Homeric poems of the eighth century B.C. These poems describe the activities of both men and gods, and to the religious consciousness perhaps the gods provided an adequate explanation of the cause of human weal and woe. But, apart from the gods, there is a constant reference in the epics of a mysterious, unseen force to which both men and gods are subject, and by which even the physical processes in the world are controlled. This force is most frequently called *Moirā*, which means 'that which has been allotted or apportioned, that which must be, or ought to be.'

In the opinion of many scholars, *Moirā*, the principle of apportionment, is prior in conception to the anthropomorphic deities.² If this is the case, the many inconsistencies that occur in the relationship between the two are the more easily explained—for *Moirā* in Homer may be superior, equal, or subordinate to the gods. Thus the supreme god Zeus frequently finds his actions restricted by the decrees of *Moirā* (Fate). At one stage in the battle between Greeks and Trojans, he declares that he would fain snatch up his mortal son Sarpedon, and save him from death at the hands

¹ *Euripides*, Fr. 713, tr. Gilbert Murray.

² See Nilsson, *History of Greek Religion*, pp. 170-1, and Cornford; *From Religion to Philosophy*, p. 18.

of Patroclus by putting him down in his fatherland of Lycia. But, since Sarpedon has long been 'doomed by Fate,' Zeus must content himself with bidding Death and Sleep bear his body to Lycia for burial.¹ Similarly, the fate of Achilles has been sealed from his early years, and neither his divine mother nor any other god can alter it. 'For your death must follow close on Hector's,' she reminds him.² At the end, when Achilles has pursued his foeman Hector thrice round the walls of Troy, the father of gods and men is shown weighing the Keres (dooms) of both heroes in a golden scale, and the doom of Hector sinks.³ This weighing-scene merely indicates poetically that Zeus has not the power to dispose of human lives as he will, but must follow the decrees of Fate.

An intermediate phase appears when Fate is in harmony with the will of the gods or the decree of Zeus. In these Zeus or the gods know and declare the fate of man, and take thought so that men shall not die contrary to or before their fate.⁴ Still other passages point to a belief that Zeus himself is the arbiter, that he is the one who decides man's lot upon earth. When in the last book of the *Iliad*, Priam has come to Achilles' tent, to ransom, if possible, the body of his son, the Greek hero receives him, and urges him to sit down and compose his grief, saying: 'This is the lot the gods have spun for miserable men, that they should live in pain; yet themselves are sorrowless. For two urns stand upon the floor of Zeus filled with his evil gifts, and one with blessings. To whomsoever Zeus, whose joy is in the lightning, dealeth a mingled lot, that man chanceth now upon ill and now again on good, but to whom he giveth but of the bad kind him he bringeth to scorn, and evil famine chaseth him over the goodly earth, and he is a wanderer honoured of neither gods nor men.'⁵

¹ *Iliad*, xvi. 433-57. ² *Iliad*, xviii. 96. ³ *Iliad*, xxii. 208-13.

⁴ *Iliad*, vii. 52-3; xx. 125-8. *Odyssey*, xx. 75-6.

⁵ *Iliad*, xxiv. 525-33, tr. Lang, Leaf and Myers.

It would appear then that there is no clear line of demarcation in Homer between the province of Fate and that of the gods, owing doubtless to the fact that Zeus and the other deities are of later growth. The gods of Homer are introduced chiefly to provide a vision of happy beings, they are a symbol of all that man would have liked to be and to do had immortality been granted him. Behind all the disputes and intrigues of the gods there is a conviction in the poet's mind that the universe is run according to an orderly system—a system beyond the comprehension of man, but working inexorably. Sometimes the system seems to be merely an embodiment of the poet's sense of the fitness of things, at others it is made to subserve the requirements of a moral code, as when Zeus, in the *Odyssey*, explains that the fate of Ægisthus was the direct consequence of sin. 'Even as of late Ægisthus, beyond that which was ordained, took to him the wedded wife of the son of Atreus and killed her lord on his return, and that with sheer doom before his eyes, since we had warned him by the embassy of Hermes the keen-sighted, the slayer of Argos, that he should neither kill the man, nor woo his wife.'¹ At times men even regard their own passions and desires as something separate from themselves and classify them as Fate. In the first book of the *Iliad* Agamemnon had seized the prize of Achilles and provoked the quarrel which led to the defeat of the Greeks at Troy, but, in speaking of his deed afterwards, he said: 'It is not I that am the cause, but Zeus and Destiny and Erinys that walketh in the darkness, who put into my soul fierce madness on the day when, in the assembly, I, even I, bereft Achilles of his meed.'² In Homer, therefore, the human being is seldom regarded as being entirely responsible for his actions. However much he may strive and pray, he is at best an instrument in the hands of superior powers.

Occasionally Fate, even in Homer, is transformed from

¹ *Odyssey*, i. 35-9, tr. Butcher and Lang.

² *Iliad*, xix. 86-9.

a principle into a separate divinity who spins the threads of man's life. In *Iliad*, xxiv. 49, the Fates are said to have made the heart of man steadfast, and in *Odyssey*, vii. 196, Alcinous declares that Odysseus will suffer 'whatever Fate and the stern spinners spun off for him with their thread at his birth.' In Hesiod and Pindar, likewise, the Fates are frequently personified.

The historian Herodotus, writing in the fifth century B.C., speaks of both an impersonal Fate and the Fates, but his conception of Fate is conjoined with the idea that the divine power is jealous, being provoked by prosperity and eminence just as much as by pride and insolence. In his third book Herodotus tells the tale of the friendship between Polycrates, tyrant of Samos, and Amasis, king of Egypt—how Amasis bade the tyrant cast away his most precious possession in order to propitiate the jealousy of the god, and how, after that possession, the ring made by Theodorus, had been marvellously restored to its owner, he concluded that it is not granted to man to save his fellow-man from the Fate that is in store for him.¹ The powerlessness of the gods themselves in the face of Destiny is expressed in the reply given by the oracle to Croesus, who complained of the ingratitude with which Delphi had rewarded his many gifts. After announcing that Croesus had been punished for the sin of a fifth ancestor, the Pythia added that Apollo had tried to postpone the fall of Sardis to the next generation, but could not persuade the Fates.² The fatal sequel to the Persian invasion is regarded by Herodotus, as it is by Æschylus, as the direct consequence of the insolence of Xerxes.

Homer's conception of Fate was borrowed by those who framed the early philosophical systems, and lent a quasi-religious colouring to some of their speculations. Heracleitus said that the world is alternately born from fire and again resolved into fire in fixed cycles to all eternity, these cycles

¹ Herodotus, iii. 40-3.

² *Ibidem*, i. 91.

being determined by Destiny. Parmenides described his One Being as 'held by mighty Necessity within the bonds of Limit.'

But we look to the tragedians for the most interesting treatment of Fate in its application to human life and conduct. Æschylus, the first of the three great tragic dramatists, was above all concerned to show that the universe is governed on moral principles. A hint of this was given even in Homer, who, in *Odyssey* i, represented Zeus as declaring to the other gods that 'mortals say that their evils come from the gods, whereas they are really the cause of their own undoing.'¹ Æschylus pursued this thought further, and endeavoured to work out a scheme that would both exonerate the gods and free man to some extent from the tyranny of Fate. Human life, in his plays, follows a definite cycle: Hybris (Arrogance), Ate (Blindness), Sin, and Nemesis (Retribution). This cycle is interwoven with the idea of the inherited curse due to the crimes of ancestors. But Æschylus is emphatic on the point that the individual is responsible for his actions, despite the family-curse. In the *Agamemnon* the chorus say: 'There is a venerable saying, which hath been framed on earth of old, that human Weal, when come to the full growth, has issue, and dies not childless: that Woe insatiable is the natural heritage of good fortune. But my view is different from the world's and single: that it is the sinful deed which begets more in the likeness of his own kind, whereas righteous houses are ever blest in their children.'² The sense of individual responsibility is well brought out in the *Seven Against Thebes*, where the hero Eteocles, fully conscious of the taint in his blood, even invokes his father's curse at the beginning of the play, but up to the moment when the messenger describes his brother Polyneices' shield, with its taunting device, he has consistently avoided the sin of Hybris, and ordered all things

¹ *Odyssey*, i. 32-4.

² Æschylus, *Agamemnon*, 749-59, tr. Headlam.

as a wise ruler should for the welfare of his city. Yet when his brother's challenge comes, he realizes that the time for restraint is past. The chorus plead with him to remain within the walls and avoid the duel, but, after a tense debate, he decides that he must go, knowing well that it will mean the death of both, and that the Curse is being fulfilled. Eteocles chooses his fate deliberately, after reflexion, and desiring nothing else, whereas Hector and other Homeric heroes resign themselves to it, as to something inevitable. In the *Persians*, Xerxes, like Eteocles, is responsible for his own ruin, for he decided in a moment of Hybris to enslave Greece. In the *Prometheus Bound* the Titan Prometheus glories in his freedom, deliberately bringing upon himself the vengeance of Zeus, while Zeus, on his side, freely decides to come to terms with Prometheus. Agamemnon, in the famous trilogy of the *Oresteia*, is a free agent, he was free to give up the war when Zeus sent him the omens, but by ignoring this warning he made his future course almost inevitable, and at Aulis he bows to the yoke of Necessity and sacrifices his daughter to appease the wrath of Artemis. In the final play, the *Eumenides*, Orestes, though impelled by Apollo to avenge his father's murder, does the deed only after anxious thought, and after realizing that the penalties of disobedience will be as severe as those of performance.

We see, therefore, that Æschylus interpreted the operation of Fate as the working of a moral law, according to which the doer acts, in the first instance, freely, and with full responsibility, but, having acted, he must inevitably bear the consequences of his act. The usual formula of this law is: 'The Doer must suffer,' and its complement is: 'By suffering we learn.' Thus, in the sequel to the *Prometheus Bound*, both Prometheus and Zeus receive training in the school of adversity.

It has been noted that in the latter play Zeus has been conceived not as all-powerful, but as a deity not yet fully

developed, being, like man, subject to the rule of Fate. 'Who holds the helm that steers Necessity?' the Chorus ask. Prometheus replies: 'The triple Fates and the remembering Furies.' To the further query: 'Is Zeus then the inferior of these in strength?' the answer is: 'At any rate he cannot escape Fate's decree.'¹ But the thought of Æschylus tended more and more towards monotheism, as is shown in the chorus of the *Agamemnon*, where Zeus is addressed as the highest and best, the only one to whom men can turn in their despair.² Along with this monotheistic attitude, we find that the relation between Zeus and Destiny suffers a change. Thus in the last extant play, the *Eumenides*, despite the fact that Zeus does not appear as an actor, the spectator feels that all the deeds of Apollo, Athena, and the Furies are meant to further the sovereign will of Zeus, which thus becomes identical with Fate. At the end of the drama the attendants say: 'Fate hath made a compact with Zeus the Olympian king.'³

In the work of Sophocles, the rationalism of the Periclean age has produced its effect. Here we find no burning desire to interpret Fate as the divine will operating in the form of a moral law. That Sophocles believed in the gods in some sense appears to be probable from many references in the plays. In the *Ajax* Teucer, lamenting over the dead body of his brother, says: 'I, at least, would deem that these things, and all things ever, are planned by gods for men.'⁴ At the close of the *Trachiniae* the chorus, who have witnessed the death of Deianeira and the passing of Heracles, are thus addressed by Hyllus: 'Maidens, come ye also; ye who have lately seen a dread death, with sorrows manifold and strange: and in all this there is nought but Zeus.'⁵ Still more clearly in the *Antigone* is the great, all-pervading

¹ Æschylus, *Prometheus Bound*, 531-4.

² Æschylus, *Agamemnon*, 170 seq.

³ Æschylus, *Eumenides*, 1046.

⁴ Sophocles, *Ajax*, 1036-7, tr. Jebb.

⁵ Sophocles, *Trachiniae*, 1275-8.

power of Zeus described: 'Thy power, O Zeus, what human trespass can restrain? The power which neither Sleep, which ensnares all else, nor the untiring mouths of the gods can master, but thou, a ruler to whom time brings not old age, dwellest in the dazzling splendour of Olympus. And through the future, near and far, as through the past, shall this law hold good. Nothing that is exceeding great moves in the life of mortals save under a doom.'¹

Sophocles apparently regarded Zeus as we should regard a force of Nature, as a being of resistless might whom it is inappropriate to judge by human standards, and to whom the ethical attributes which human beings prize are hardly applicable. It is the Zeus of Homer freed from the domination of Fate and from anthropomorphic foibles and weaknesses. As Dr. Sheppard says: 'The gods of Sophocles stand for the universe of circumstance as it is.' Sophocles agrees with Æschylus that everything which is exceeding great is liable to fall, and that the great lesson to be learned is that of Sophrosyne (Prudence or Safe-mindedness), which keeps men from perilous undertakings. In this scheme, however, Fate is not connected with Sin or Arrogance as unequivocally as in Æschylus; it resides more often in the external circumstances which man cannot control, and which appear to be linked together mysteriously by some unseen power. Such a Fate cannot be avoided; yet man is free, in so far as he is free to decide how he shall react to it. Thus Antigone and Ismene, placed in the same circumstances, react differently, owing to a fundamental difference in their characters. Œdipus, when the terrible truth about himself is made clear to him, freely undertakes to expiate his involuntary sin, and, in the *Oedipus at Coloneus*, after many sufferings, he is represented as ending his life in submission to the divine will.

In all the plays mentioned above, circumstance appears to determine Fate to a greater extent than character. In the *Philoctetes*, however, we notice a novel development.

¹ Sophocles, *Antigone*, 604-14.

There a special study is made of the character of Neoptolemus, who is represented as a frank and honourable youth who has been induced by political arguments to help Odysseus in an act of duplicity. But when he is brought face to face with the misery of their dupe Philoctetes, he finds himself unable to carry out his promise. His better nature finds itself in sharp conflict with the motive of ambition, to which Odysseus had appealed, and in consequence thereof the plot is in danger of developing in an unexpected fashion, not in accordance with tradition. The *deus ex machina*, in the shape of the spirit of Heracles, has to appear to divert Philoctetes and Neoptolemus from their proposed action, and to bring the play to its usual conclusion. Nevertheless we have been made aware of a new factor in human life and history—the tendency of personal motives, desires and passions to rise up and influence a man's actions and destiny.

This tendency attains fuller development in Euripides, in whose plays the compulsion to act comes not so much from the external situation as from the inner self, the conflicting impulses and instincts with which a man is born. In the *Hippolytus*, for instance, the fate of Phaedra is to be found within her own breast, in the disastrous passion that destroys a being naturally chaste. In *Medea* we see a conflict between love for her children and hatred of the husband who has slighted her; the latter impulse prevails so completely that she murders her children. In the *Trojan Women* Helen blames Aphrodite for her desertion of Menelaus and the ruin of Troy, but in Euripides, Aphrodite stands, not for an anthropomorphic goddess, but for the passion of Love, regarded for the moment as a force external to the person whom it inspires. 'Aphrodite,' says Hecuba, 'is the name for every human folly.'¹ Human passions, therefore, not the gods, are responsible for the downfall of Troy.

Besides the tendency to look for man's fate within him, we may discern in Euripides a desire to lay stress on another

¹ Euripides, *Trojan Women*, 989.

element in experience—Chance or Fortune. Chance has been called ‘the new scientific name for Fate.’¹ The supporters of Chance believe that events take place because of the interaction of unknown, incalculable factors or forces. This conception gains ground in Greek thought as the personal, anthropomorphic gods lose ground. Even in Sophocles we find a few echoes of the sophistic discussion about Fortune. Œdipus, in his speech to the chorus, calls himself a ‘son of Fortune.’² Jocasta, disparaging the value of oracles, says: ‘What should mortal fear, for whom the decrees of Fortune are supreme, and who hath clear foresight of nothing? ’Tis best to live at random, as one may.’³ But in Euripides Fortune is still more in evidence. In the *Ion* the whole tragedy is made to depend on Chance, the haphazard encounter between mother and son, when two people who should naturally be well-disposed to each other try to slay each other. In the *Hecuba* the herald Talthybius wonders whether it is Chance that rules, and not the gods, since the queen of Troy and her children have been brought so low.⁴ In the *Cyclops* Odysseus calls upon Hephaestus and Sleep to aid him to take vengeance on the monster—‘else must one deem Chance a god, and the power of the gods to be less than Fortune.’⁵

In seeking the origin of events in human impulses, on the one hand, and in the agency of Fortune, on the other, Euripides is in agreement with another great rationalist, the historian Thucydides. The latter, too, leaves the gods out of account, and gives his readers half-personified emotions, such as Hope, Fear, Persuasion, Desire, laying stress also on Fortune. The Athenian Diodotus, in his speech against the Mytilenean Decree, remarked: ‘Hope and Cupidity, the one leading and the other following, cause the widest ruin, and, although invisible agents, are far stronger than the

¹ Cornford, *Greek Religious Thought*, xxiii (introd.).

² Sophocles, *Oedipus Tyrannus*, 1080. ⁴ Euripides, *Hecuba*, 488.

³ *Ibidem*, 977–9.

⁵ Euripides, *Cyclops*, 606–7.

496 FATE IN ANCIENT GREEK LITERATURE

dangers that are seen. Fortune, too, powerfully helps the delusion, and by the unexpected aid that she sometimes lends, tempts men to venture with inferior means.¹

Later still, in the fourth century B.C., Fortune became a capricious goddess, whose influence in human affairs was symbolized as a revolving wheel of wayward movement. Menander, the leading writer of New Comedy, makes one of his characters say: 'Mortal sense is nothing more than Chance. It is this that governs, steers and preserves all things: human forethought is vapour and rubbish. Be convinced, and you will not blame me. All our thoughts, words and acts are Chance, and we are sealed as hers. Chance governs all. Unless we delight in empty names, this goddess alone must we call Mind and Providence.'²

In the meantime, however, a movement of an entirely different nature was making itself felt in Greek philosophical thought. Anaxagoras of Clazomenae, who spent some time at Athens in the fifth century B.C., had introduced into contemporary science the notion of Mind as a moving cause. In the *Phaedo* of Plato Socrates remarks that he had listened with disappointment to the way in which this moving cause was applied—merely to set up a mechanical rotation, and so account for the physical properties of things. From so divine a mover Socrates had expected results of a different character. If Mind directs things, surely it must direct them for the best, and the established order would then be the best possible.³ Thus Socrates was led by his reaction to the doctrine of Anaxagoras to assume the existence of a good God and an all-seeing Providence. Not an impersonal Fate, but a personal God was responsible for the order of the physical world and also for the events in individual lives. It was God who had posted him in Athens, and commanded him to interrogate his fellow-citizens,⁴ and the Fate

¹ *Thucydides*, iii, 45, 5-6, tr. Crawley.

² *Menander*, Fr. 482-3, tr. G. Norwood.

³ Plato, *Phaedo*, 97, C-98 B.

⁴ Plato, *Apology*, 28 E.

that he hears calling him in the *Phaedo* (115A) is the same as divine Providence. In the defence which he made at his trial, Plato represents him as saying: 'It is impossible for any evil to overtake a good man, either living or dead, nor are his affairs neglected by the gods; neither has my present experience happened by chance, but it is evident to me that it was better for me to die now, and be freed from trouble.'¹ The same Providence which had guided his own career was equally active in the control of the universe. If we may accept Xenophon's description of Socrates as authentic, the latter believed that the appearance of design in Nature was adequate proof of the far-reaching wisdom of God, who was able 'to see all things and hear all things, and be present everywhere.'²

Plato, following in his footsteps, declared in the *Timaeus* that the author of the universe was good, and that he desired all things to be as like himself as possible.³ Therefore the world is a 'living creature possessing soul and reason by the providence of God,'⁴ and within this world other living creatures arise 'according to fated laws.' At first all souls are equal, but thereafter they are ordained to rise or sink in the scale of existence according as they follow after righteousness or forsake it. In the *Laws* this scheme is explained at greater length. 'Let us persuade our young man,' says the Athenian stranger, 'that the power who cares for the universe has disposed all things with a view to the preservation and excellence of the whole system, in which each part, according to the measure of its capacity, does and suffers what properly belongs to it . . . and he contrived that every portion of soul should be posted in that place where it shall most easily and perfectly promote in the whole universe the triumph of virtue and the defeat of vice. He contrived, in fact, for this general end, that there should always be a right place for every character, to fill as it develops

¹ *Ibidem*, 41 D.

³ Plato, *Timaeus*, 29 E-30 A.

² Xenophon, *Memorabilia Socratis*, i, 4, 18.

⁴ *Ibidem*, 30 B.

from time to time, a proper region for it to inhabit, but he left to the will of each one the acts that are responsible for his becoming such as he is. For, speaking generally, the manner of every man's birth is determined by his desires, and the character he is born with corresponds to the character his soul has already acquired. Whatever, then, has a living soul changes by virtue of an inward principle, and, as it changes, moves according to the order and law of destiny.¹

Fate, therefore, has become for Plato a part of the providence of God, operating according to the law of transmigration and discipline. By this law man chooses his fate, that is, chooses his career for the next incarnation, but his choice is predetermined by the character that he acquired in previous lives. In the very picturesque allegory of *Republic* x, Er, the son of Arminius, sees in a vision the souls of the dead choosing their lives for the next incarnation in a mysterious spot, where sit the Three Fates at the spindle of Necessity. Although, in this vision, the souls choose in the order of the lot, the lives are more numerous than the souls present, so that each has freedom of choice, but each chooses in accordance with the character it has previously borne.² Thus Fate, according to Plato's scheme, is neither capricious nor unjust, it is the achievement of a good and just Providence, working through an inexorable law.

But the conception of a Fate dependent upon Providence finds its most complete expression in the philosophy of the Stoics, and it is not unlikely that the Platonic belief in a divine plan, and in a universe created in accordance with that plan, had considerable influence upon the development of their system. Aristotle, too, had pointed out the way by his insistence on the purposefulness of Nature. According to the Stoics, the world is a harmonious whole, permeated through and through by a power which, from the spiritual point of view, is called Soul or Reason, but on the material

¹ Plato, *Laws*, 903 B; 904 B-C, tr. F. M. Cornford.

² Plato, *Republic* x. 617 B-620 A.

side is called Fire, Ether, Air or Pneuma (Atmospheric Current). This Soul is the god of the universe, and may be regarded further as Universal Law, as Nature or Destiny or Providence. If any difference is to be drawn between God and Nature and Destiny, it is that they are different manifestations of the same being. This being develops in cycles, since the primary fire evolves into a universe, and at the general conflagration disintegrates again into its original form, pure Fire or Deity. Then a new world immediately begins to form, which corresponds so minutely with the previous world that every event, every object, every person recurs. Such was the belief of the majority of the Stoics, including Chrysippus. From this scheme it follows that everything depends on the course of the universe as a whole, and that there is a nexus of causes running through the world. This causal necessity is expressed in the conception of Fate or Destiny, so that it is not the individual but Fate that thinks, speaks, and acts. Fate, having so vast a range, contains within itself all religious, moral, and political values, since all laws, customs, or rites, all penalties or admonitions, all praise or blame, all arts and crafts, are pre-ordained and foreknown. To the objection that man cannot therefore be blamed for his faults, some Stoics replied that, although every action must contribute to the divine plan, nevertheless it is better for the individual to act willingly than under compulsion. The position of the individual is compared by Chrysippus to that of a dog who is harnessed to a cart which he must pull willy-nilly. The attitude of the wise man is one of acquiescence in the will of the universe. Cleanthes, the second head of the Stoic school, and author of the most sublime hymn of Stoicism, expressed his own feeling about Fate in these words:

Lead me, O Zeus, lead Thou me, Destiny,
By whatsoever path ye have ordained.
I will not flinch; but if, to evil prone,
My will rebelled, I needs must follow still.¹

¹ *Cleanthes*, Fr. 91, tr. R. D. Hicks.

500 FATE IN ANCIENT GREEK LITERATURE

We have traced the development of the conception of Fate from the vague and mysterious force that directs events in the Homeric poems to the benevolent Providence of the Stoics. In the hands of Aeschylus it first became associated with an ethical theory, being identified with the will of Zeus and working for the moral regeneration of man through the law of suffering. In Sophocles it may still be regarded as the will of Zeus, but as expressed in the external circumstances of life. In Euripides it is man's character, or the impulses within him, that produce his fate, likewise Chance, an irresponsible and capricious power, has to be reckoned with, for she has a large share in the making of history. With Socrates and Plato, Fate is linked to the divine Providence of the gods, who have ordered all things well. Finally, in the doctrine of the Stoics, it becomes the great Law of the Universe, controlling the whole course of events, and directing the lives of all creatures, great and small.

MARIE V. WILLIAMS, M.A.

*Witwatersrand University,
Johannesburg, South Africa.*

Digging with the Unemployed. By John S. Hoyland.
(Student Christian Movement Press. 2s.)

This describes the effort of a small group, working in South Wales in 1931, to search after the Christian solution of the problem of unemployment in the town where the experiment was made. Eighty per cent. of the people were out of work, many for ten years. The coal industry, once the source of immense wealth, had gone beyond recall. A Swiss schoolmaster and members of the Service Civile Internationale came to help the group. The Welshmen themselves had been refined by privation and showed the group extraordinary kindness. By the end of the summer of 1932 the work in the mining town was sufficiently advanced to need no further assistance from the group and similar work was undertaken in other places. It is a moving record and leads to the conclusion that in such labours any touch of patronage or charity must be avoided. The outside workers should share the meals of the people, paying for their food and lodgings, and will thus gain real experience of the conditions and find themselves surrounded with goodwill and friendliness. It is a record rich in encouragement and full of suggestions for the relief of unemployment.

ART AND RELIGION

'There is much in common between Art and Religion, or conscience. But there is a difference. The one will not do the work of the other for the soul. Art ministers to insight and its joy, religion to conscience and its faith.'—P. T. FORSYTH.

IN considering the relative position and rank of art and religion, several fundamental principles will be found to underlie the various determinative aspects of their connexion and interaction. These demand careful discrimination and must be minutely weighed before any fit appraisalment can be made or final judgement arrived at. From the history of their association, it will be fairly conclusive that the relation of art and religion, though mutual, is not equal. Religion has given more to art than art has given to religion, and the influence of religion on art has been more powerful than that of art on religion. Thus, qualitatively and quantitatively, religion's right to superior rank must be indisputably conceded. Nor are the reasons justifying such a claim far to seek, since religion (1) deals with essential, absolute realities; (2) creates supreme moral obligations; (3) secures effective spiritual results, the like of which in true values, art can only attempt to represent.

I.—In essence, religion is absolute; art is conditional. Religion has to do with final reality, while art is concerned with the beautiful appearance of things. Art presents to us forms of life; religion gives us the foundation of life. The movement of art is to materialize the spiritual; the movement of religion is to spiritualize the material. Art relieves the world's power over the oppressed heart; religion breaks the world's dominion over the guilty soul. The one releases and refreshes; the other redeems and regenerates. The one is a transient visitation; the other, an eternal possession by the spirit. Religion's concern is with the Absolute—spirit, which can only be spiritually discerned—therefore, it is as irrelevant as irreverent to attempt to embody it completely in sensible

forms. In this respect art's relation to religion must be ancillary and subservient. Her service is obedient, because her sanction is derived. Art is thus the seemly handmaid, though not the servile vassal of religion. Her dignity is stately; her honours, ambassadorial. Art is here, as in Milton's profoundly suggestive verses 'On the Morning of Christ's Nativity'—

Heaven's youngest star,
Her sleeping Lord with handmaid lamp attending:
And all about the courtly stable,
Bright-harnessed angels sit in order serviceable.

II.—In ethic, religion is authoritative; art is derivative. The ethical authority of religion is complete and consummate, therefore commanding and controlling; but the ethical authority of art is imperfect and intermediate, because only implicit and inferential. That art has certain great moral principles of its own is indubitable, and in consequence thereof it has a moral mission, however indirect. Art demands a disciplined will and so summons into activity moral powers. It calls for the exercise of selection and idealization. It must produce; therefore, the artist must become, in his degree, a master of his art, and this mastery of art will be determined as much by his moral qualities as by his technical excellence. As Holman Hunt puts it: 'All Art is a branch of that spirit of appeal from the divine to the universal, which has been working ever since our kind knew good from evil. In the exercise of her holy function, Art must sort out the good and the beautiful from the base and hideous.' But the ethical source of this power of selection, like all moral choice, runs back into religion. Art cannot prescribe morals—not even its own—but religion does. *Æsthetic* fantasy is one thing; religious faith is another, and it is religion that commands life and commands art as a part of life. 'Art,' says Dr. Forsyth, 'is not life, but an interpretation of life. And as life's interpreter, she is not life's guide but life's distinguished friend. The guide of life speaks to life's conscience. And

none can speak the last word to life's conscience but He who takes away its sin. The root of morality is not the art which appeals to some, but the Redemption which embraces all.'¹ With a profound insight does Goethe sing:—

Youth remember! In the throbbing,
In the flush, of sense and soul,
That the muse is but a comrade,
And her place is not control.

A theory of Art, the reverse of that which is here presented, is known as 'Art for art's sake.' And some of those who hold it have produced many works of great technical excellence and beauty, and also many which it would have been better, even for art itself had they never been produced. Taine defines this doctrine as 'painting the passions, the sentiments of the soul, as they are and not troubling about their ethical worth or significance.' In this connexion, Ruskin must again be heard. 'Art,' he says, 'followed as such and for its own sake, irrespective of the interpretation of nature, is destructive of whatever is best and noblest in humanity. Whenever art is practised for its own sake, and the delight of the workman is in what he does and produces, instead of what he interprets or exhibits, there art has an influence of the most fatal kind on brain and heart, and it issues, if long pursued, in the destruction both of intellectual power and moral principle.' Certainly, nudity is not always synonymous with beauty—the one is always a gospel, the other may be a doomspell. As Hope Rea pertinently remarks in the work on *Tuscan Art*: 'His (Titian's) representation of Venus is more woman than goddess; it was the physical beauties to which he paid homage. His women have never a touch of divinity, and even the dignity of womanhood he fails to represent in his later years.' And, be it remembered that Titian is supremely the Artist's artist.

'Art for art's sake' has not infrequently been an exhibition of poor taste and worse ethics; and a morality of taste,

¹ *Christ on Parnassus.*

the ethic of the agreeable, can never, in a moral universe, be a substitute for that purity of heart which truth ever demands of her seers and interpreters. Time and again, the cult of 'Art for art's sake' has reared its gorgeous fanes, built its decorated altars and promulgated its revised decalogue of artificial taste and unofficial ethic, proclaiming in the name of its goddess that genius is its own lawgiver and judge, and offering to her devotees exemption from the restraints and obligations of ordinary moral standards. But the serene, indomitable conscience always, ultimately, asserts its supreme ethical prerogative, arraigns the false prophets of art, and in the name of Beauty, which is Goodness and Truth, enthrones religion as the final moral authority and sole ethical arbiter.

III.—In effect, religion is assurance; art is suggestion. Art has a religious source, but it cannot give religious security; it is religious in sanction, but not in function. Religion is inspiration; art is interpretation. The one convinces, the other conveys. True art is not the artist's own idea imported into Nature; it is Nature's idea articulated through the artist. Impelled by his perception of the idea of perfection, the artist must represent it. But the ideal in real imagination and ideal art is not the gift of art. Art offers no such assurance. It can quicken spiritual sensibility, but it cannot create spiritual certainty. That is faith's gift and not art's.

But, this is not to say that religious devotion is a guarantee of artistic technique, or that spiritual exaltation even is an assurance of æsthetic excellence. Indeed, on the contrary, let it be said that not infrequently, bad men have been consummate artists, and more frequently, good men have produced art of the veriest banality. Such phenomena appear paradoxical, but are by no means inexplicable. The effect of an age's religion on art is always powerful. So much so that a great genius unconsciously expresses more than his own personality. His works are indices of the soul of his times. He speaks of more than he knows, and utters something mightier than the weakness or vice even of his life can

silence. An artist may not paint the better because he prays, for the simple reason that it is not as artist, but as man, that he prays. But the fact to be here recognized, and the point to be insisted upon, is that prayer, faith and religious devotion do give the artist's personality a religious confidence, a spiritual intimacy, a devotional passion, a moral courage that by a subjective transmutation expresses itself in an objective transubstantiation. His art thus becomes not only revelation, but a sacrament.

Thus, while great art is not produced for the artist's sake—for what really matters is the thing seen, not the seer; the message, not the man—nevertheless, every work of art must necessarily reveal something of the character of the artist. No painting, poem or musical composition can be entirely devoid of ethical qualities and subjective elements imported into it. Beauty is beauty in virtue of its being a manifestation of spirit, and since spirit can reveal itself only to spirit—soul to soul—the artist must possess soul before he can truly discern or adequately depict the essence of Beauty. Only under the influence of religious inspiration the artist awakes to the consciousness that Nature, which he is to interpret, is everywhere in its pulsing life the emanation and expression of the universal, immanent, Divine soul.

But if his work is thus inspired, then the artist works for an Inspirer. To create life in the soul alone makes art possible. Thus, religion produces that which produces art, and he is not necessarily an artist who does art the greatest service. That which creates man anew quickens every creative power in man. Where man is spiritually quickened, there is freedom, and there the thinker and artist will not fail from out the land. In its last analysis, great art depends on great faith, since that which brings God to man and enthrones Him in the human spirit inspires the best human powers and draws forth the highest possibility. As Lord Balfour shows in his Gifford lectures: 'It is only in a Theistic setting that beauty can retain its deepest meaning, and love

its brightest lustre, so these great truths of æsthetics and ethics are but half-truths, isolated and imperfect, unless we add to them a third. We must hold that reason and the works of reason have their source in God; that from Him they draw their inspiration; and that if they repudiate their origin, by this very act they proclaim their own insufficiency.¹

Thus, then, to sum up, while the relation of art to religion is mutual it is not equal. The one activity is causal and creative, authoritative and dynamical; the other is derivative and reproductive, dependent and subservient. Differing in essence and origin, they differ in faculty and function. They are

Not like to like, but like in difference.

Or, to borrow an older allusion to the analogous problem, as Milton says of Adam and Eve, they were

Not equal as their sex not equal seemed;
For contemplation he and valour formed,
For softness she and sweet attractive grace,
He for God only, and she for God in him.

Art is but a third loyalty in life; the true order being, first, God; then, religion; and then, art.

BRIAN WIBBERLEY, Mus. Bac.

¹ *Humanism and Theism*, p. 274.

Unity and Truth in the Church of England, by J. F. Bethune-Baker, D.D. (Cambridge University Press. 1s.). In his sermon on 'That they all may be one' Professor Baker clearly admits that no forms can be binding on all Christians. 'Particular folds may remain.' The Church exists to proclaim the doctrine of the Incarnation which commends the love of God for us as no other doctrine does, and shows the real values and worth of our own lives. Unity within the Church of England does not mean being of one mind as to whether bishops are of the *esse* or the *bene esse* of the Church, or whether in the point of order they are 'among the things indifferent.' The subject is handled in a broad-minded manner which is refreshing.

Five Minutes' Interval, compiled by P. J. Fisher (Epworth Press. 2s. 6d.), is a set of devotional suggestions which provoke thought, guide meditation, and enrich the life of prayer.

THE FREUDIAN ILLUSION

WITHIN living memory the controversy between science and religion took place chiefly between biology on the one hand and biblical history on the other. The Darwinian theory seemed to overturn the foundations of theology, fixed as these seemed to be in a story which the Roman Church at least has not yet disavowed. To-day the discussion centres about a theory of human nature, and the protagonists are what is called the New Psychology on the one hand and Philosophical Theology on the other. If people only realized it they would find that the new controversy is much more vital than the earlier one, involving as it does not merely an important fact of history, but a question of the competence of the human mind to construct a theology at all. Those who hail the New Psychology as the last word of mental science need to be aware of its implications.

The professed and generally accepted creator of psychoanalysis is Sigismund Freud. In his book, *The Future of an Illusion*, he discusses this very question of the relation of his speciality with religion, and rather than wander at large over the vast fields of psychology and theology I propose to concentrate upon the specific problems raised by Freud. Here we have the issue in its most acute form, and its decision here will react upon the whole area of discussion. I propose therefore to expound Freud's views at some length, then to examine them critically, and finally to suggest some lines of construction which are common both to a reasonable psychology and to a rational theology. The reader will already have gathered that according to Freud religion is an illusion, and that the upshot of his argument is that it is an illusion which has no future!

According to Freud, human culture and civilization—that is, the mastery of Nature combined with social and economic regulations—depend upon a vast repression of

instincts. These instincts are anti-cultural and anti-social; they are the secret motives of the masses of men and are kept in order only by the prestige of persons of superior insight. Such instincts are notably those of incest, cannibalism and murder, which are revealed by psycho-analysis to lie at the roots of human nature. Culture requires the renunciation of these and similar egoistic impulses, and such sacrifices can be ensured only by powerful agencies. Amongst these pre-eminent is religion, which by means of certain terrors and hopes has induced men to lay aside their instinctual desires, and by doctrines of sanctions, rewards and punishments, dreams of a future life, and in general of wish-fulfilments, has induced men to lead a conventionally social and moral life. These ideas are summed up in the accepted modern Christian idea of a providential Father.

Religion, we have seen, springs from the same need as all the other achievements of culture: from the necessity of defending itself against the crushing supremacy of Nature, and from the eager desire to correct the so painfully felt defects of culture.¹ And it does so by means of the Fatherhood complex, which springs from childish craving for protection against the external world. It thus consists of a number of dogmas attaching to ideas which one values, dogmas which, however, are unverified and unverifiable. They are so by the admission of religionists, who require them to be taken on trust, going so far as to say, 'I believe although (or even because) it is absurd.' Freud naturally asks whether he is to believe every absurdity, or if not, why this particular one.

Or again, dogma may be defended by an 'as if' philosophy, which admits that its ideas are only 'fictions,' but asserts that though its hypotheses are theoretically false they are practically useful, and hence are justifiable. Like the former attitude (of faith) this one (of 'fiction') is only an evasion.

¹ *The Future of an Illusion*, p. 37.

It appears, then, that religion is an illusion; but this statement must be properly understood. It is not necessarily a *delusion*, for that would be positive falsity. It is an illusion in the sense of a wish-fulfilment, and is neither provable nor disprovable. It is like the poor girl's dream that a prince may come and marry her, or the alchemists' fancy that lead may be transmuted into gold. These are not impossible, yet merely prompted by secret longings. We call a belief an illusion when wish-fulfilment is a prominent factor in its motivation, while disregarding its relations to reality, just as the illusion itself does (pp. 54-5). In this sense religious doctrines are illusions, being wish-fulfilment and hence not knowledge. Yet ignorance is ignorance. We must say to ourselves: 'it would be very nice if there were a God who was both creator of the world and a benevolent providence, if there were a moral world order and a future life, but at the same time it is very odd that it is all just as we should wish it ourselves. And it would be still odder if our poor, ignorant, enslaved ancestors had succeeded in solving all these difficult riddles of the universe' (p. 58).

In spite of its role as fulfiller of wishes, religion has not really satisfied the masses, who are now becoming disillusioned and in danger of repudiating all culture along with it. To obviate these threats to civilization, we must understand it by psycho-analysing it. Then we see that it is a universal obsessional neurosis, and that dogmas are neurotic survivals of the childhood of the race. They are symbols, chiefly of repressed sexual desires. They are responsible for the feeble mentality of most adults compared with the bright intelligence of a healthy child (p. 82). Hence it is time to try a great experiment, and do without these narcotics. We must educate to reality.

Let us leave the heavens
To the angels and the sparrows.

As a substitute we must adopt science, which is concerned not with phantasy but with reality. Possibly this is a pre-

carious resource, for it is by no means certain that mankind can do without its narcotics and live in the dry light of science. But it is our only hope. Science has been born of contact with the outer world, to which it must have a certain degree of correspondence. It is therefore no illusion, like the religion which it is destined to supersede.

In commenting upon Freud's theory we may pursue his own order, and ask, first, whether his opposition of a state of Nature and a state of culture is really warranted. It is an old trick to oppose these two. Rousseau did so but gave the palm to Nature; Freud finds Nature red in tooth and claw and glorifies culture or civilization. This is perhaps a nineteenth-century error. Certainly an important recent school of anthropologists (Massingham, Perry, Elliot Smith,) find uncivilized man to be mild, kind, and unwarlike. Freud's vices of murder, cannibalism and incest seem to be a rare occurrence, to be accounted for by exceptional circumstances. War seems to be connected with that great institution of 'civilization'—private property.

However this may be, Nature in another sense of Freud's—as a system of uniform laws, as reality over against phantasy—is shown by Mr. Whitehead to be a product of mediaeval scholasticism, of that very religious philosophy which Freud despises (see *Science in the Modern World*, ch. 1). Rather than accept Rousseau's or Freud's view of the relation of Nature to art, we had better say with a character of Shakespeare

Yet nature is made better by no mean
But nature makes that mean.

As for religion's part in this task of civilizing, it is by no means clear that it consists in the threefold task of exorcizing the terrors of Nature, reconciling one to the cruelty of fate—particularly as shown in death—and making amends for the sacrifices required by the cultural life (p. 30). Nor is it plain that the latest God of the West—the Christian—is a god of culture-values in any very pronounced sense. Rather has it

often been asserted by other critics of religion that it has enhanced the terrors of Nature, heightened the fear of death, and intensified the demands of culture. And the tendency of the Christian religion—on one side of it—has been to sit in judgement upon civilization, notably the Roman but also the pagan culture of any day, say the eighteenth century. Certainly a recent movement in theology, going back to Calvinism, has emphasized the opposition between religion and human culture-values. One must conclude that Freud's history is rather a fanciful picture, not based upon science, but upon the supposed discoveries of psycho-analysis, and is prone to emphasize one side or another of history as his argument requires.

Next, as to Freud's references to historical theology: the non-verifiability of religious dogmas, compared with the laws of science, is a myth based upon ignorance of theological method. Certainly the despised Scholastics—besides being the fathers of Naturalism—were (and are) just those who insist upon rigid proof and demonstration of their theses. Critical and experimental theology are, further, modern varieties of verificatory religion. The teaching of belief in the absurd is confined to a few, and those certainly not the orthodox, theologians. As for 'fictional' theology—a theology of 'as if' or of mere pragmatism—it is confined to a school: a school, moreover, which has close affiliations with a school of scientists—represented by Poincaré, Mach and Karl Pearson—who do not find science claiming to be true but only useful or convenient. Whether or not the foregoing tendencies in theology be 'evasions,' Freud's implied thesis that they are representative of theology in general is only ignorant assertion amounting to dogmatism.

This brings us to Freud's central contention, that religion is wish-fulfilment or phantasy, and the avoidance of reality. Though, as we have said, much religion is opposed to our wishes, yet what if religion were largely a projection of our wishes upon the cosmos? Would it be in any different case

from science? This we have just seen to be, according to some of its champions, pragmatic and utilitarian. And certainly its appeal to the masses is chiefly based upon that fact. It would seem then to stand or fall with religion, so far as they have a common method. Further, can it be claimed that science has satisfied the masses, or are they in revolt against what it has done or may do, destructively, for modern culture? And is religion any more symbolic than science, which recently in the mouths of leaders like Jeans and Eddington has loudly announced its entirely schematic and symbolic character? These writers indeed invoke the reality discoverable by religious insight to redress the deficiency caused by the symbolic nature of scientific knowledge.

It must appear then that a universal obsession (Freud, p. 76), such as religion, cannot be called an illusion or 'neurosis' at all. Surely a neurosis is a local or partial affliction, not universal. If the latter, how did Freud come to find it out, or if he is the exception, is he not abnormal? Further, if it is an infantile disease, as widespread as measles, why is the healthy child so radiantly intelligent compared with the average adult and his feeble mentality? Surely the argument requires that the feeble mentality of the child persists into manhood! Or can it be that it is the little Freudians, who early see through the illusion, who alone escape the infection? If so, how is it that the masses in general are becoming disillusioned? Apparently they are putting away childish narcotics and taking to the strong meat of science. Unfortunately science itself is loudly proclaiming that it is only a patent medicine, very much the product of artifice, and by no means capable of acting as a substitute for our elemental instincts.

Nick Bottom in *Midsummer Night's Dream* remarked of his drama: 'It shall be called Bottom's play because it hath no bottom.' Shall we be able to say that Freud's *The Future of an Illusion* is an illusionary future, and that science and theology, psychology and religion, will continue to move

together in mutual support? They both rest upon human hopes and fears, and they both require a principle of faith along with a method of verification. The modes of verification may differ, as they do within the sciences themselves. But the long experience of the race, winnowing ancient beliefs and experimenting with new faiths, is itself a vast verification which is steadily going on, and which in the long run purifies and reconciles both religion and science, making religion more scientific and science more religious.

ATKINSON LEE, M.A.

Choose Ye The Blessed Life. By Alfred Norman. (James Clarke & Co. 5s.)

The choice indicated in the title is between Jehovah and Baal—or their later representatives. The policy of the prophets of Baal, we are told, was to increase material prosperity. It was the early counterpart of the more modern cult of materialism. Good buildings, material comforts and mercantile extension usually multiplied under the worship of Baal. But it is also well known that despotism resulted, and enmities and wars ensued. While the prophets of Jehovah were regarded as Idealists because they offered a religious solution as opposed to a materialist solution of the nation's ills, yet they were more Realists in the abiding sense than the prophets of Baal. The author considers God as Idea—not ideas or an idea—not just an image existing in the mind. He can be conceived but not perceived. Conception is arrived at by right contemplation. And perfect conception will reveal Idea as Love; not only loving; not *doing* something but *being* something. It is in the perfect contemplation of God that man finds his way into the Blessed Life. The book contains some interesting theories about such practical problems as Education, Politics and Economics. It asserts that the perfect social State, the Kingdom of God on earth, cannot come until all men contemplate this earth as God contemplates it. The individual's contribution to the perfect State is not by *doing* but by *being*. The doing is not within his power; the being is his personal responsibility.

W.R.C.

THE NEW COMMUNITY AND PAUL

THE correspondence of St. Paul sets before us with a dramatic vividness not only the details of his own inner life, but those of the inner life of the little communities he established or with which he came into contact. We move with him from Galatia to Corinth, from Philippi to Colossae, from Ephesus to Rome. His letters, varying in intention and manner, recreate for us the very atmosphere of these original centres. There are many questions they leave unanswered, and there are many obscure incidents unexplained. But few letters from the ancient world obliterate the intervening centuries and set us in the midst of such throbbing and restless life. How far does Paul's correspondence reveal to us the common facts of early Christian life? The question is no unimportant one.

'The fundamental fallacy,' writes Canon Streeter, 'of the histories of the Apostolic age inspired by the Tübingen school are the tacit assumption that Gentile Christianity was of a single type, and that that type was the creation of Paul.'¹ It is most probable that the diversity we have seen to exist in the early Christian community in theological belief and church order should also have existed in religious experience. So spontaneous a movement, spreading in such an unpremeditated manner from city to city, would of necessity present a variety of qualities. Christianity was in Antioch and Rome, possibly also in Ephesus, before Paul arrived, and no fact is clearer than that he did not create Gentile Christianity.

But the witness of Paul is one of the chief integrating factors of early Christian life. Though Christianity had spread to important places like Rome and Antioch before he began his missionary career, and while he himself came to his clear understanding of Christian principles through a profound

¹ *The Primitive Church*, p. 44.

religious experience, the fact that he could find a home in Antioch and represent that city, and could write such a letter as he did to the Christians in Rome, suggests that his approach to Christian issues was not in any fundamental disagreement with the spreading movement. It is more probable that he found in the representatives of Gentile Christianity—or at least of the 'Hellenists' like Stephen—an attitude akin to his own, and that he developed this point of view with his own peculiar genius and in the light of his own profound experiences. We mark no radical change when he turns from writing to his own Galatian churches to writing to the church in Rome which he had not established.¹ The tendency to isolate Paul from the common experience of his contemporary Christians is as far from the truth as the tendency to picture him as the creator of Gentile Christianity. The fact that his letters have survived at all, preserved by the various communities to which they were written, and were exalted to the pre-eminent place they occupy in the New Testament Canon points to the community Christians in general felt with his spirit and ideas.

In Paul we have a man of outstanding genius and profound religious insight who laid his hand upon the early communities and contributed in no small way to the development of the Christian movement. But we have no evidence to doubt that on the whole, while we need to discern what is peculiar to his experience, and genius, Paul's letters reflect the common Christianity of the non-Jewish churches in an extraordinary manner. This is not to mean that the peculiar phraseology of Paul or his peculiar theological ideas were necessarily common property, but that the type of life we

¹ 'It is a striking fact that in all the various communities which he (i.e. Paul) addresses he not only uses the same form of appeal, but evidently feels himself justified in presuming that the same spiritual experiences are common to them all and common in them all, expressed in the same synonymous terms.' C. Anderson Scott, *New Testament Ethics*, pp. 87 f.

see revealed in his letters, and to which he appeals and which he seeks to develop, is representative of the inner life of those communities which most truly stood in the line of authentic Christian development.

Our concern is with the nature of that type of religious experience which was the bond of fellowship among the Christian communities. It was most explicitly and decisively exhibited in the life of Paul himself, but we miss the significance of his letters if we see in them only the record of his own inner spiritual history. His letters were not written in a vacuum. They were written to definite people about definite problems and with the intention of securing definite decisions. Though they are couched in a language forged by Paul's own restless mind and though they approach problems along argumentative roads built by his own experience and history, they deal with problems that were real to the various communities themselves, and their ultimate arguments are arguments that they could appreciate and approve. Paul's letters were real letters, not disguised treatises.

For our purpose it will be most fruitful to take a letter where the problems of a local community are most conspicuous and individual, where we can see, as it were, the faces of the people most clearly. The more individual and particular are the problems, the more useful will they be. For we are concerned with the underlying arguments that Paul brought to specific cases and situations. What we want to know is not so much how Paul approached large general issues as how he dealt with specific people, and upon what grounds he appealed to them. The First Letter to the Corinthians lifts the veil upon the inner life of Paul's correspondents as no other letter does. One by one the problems that were disturbing them pass before our eyes—the sectarianism that divided them, their moral deviations, their problems of church order and private religious practice, their intellectual dilemmas. No ancient Christian community lives so vividly

before us. And we know that other letters¹ were written by Paul to them—one dealing with some dark episode which threatened to destroy Paul's authority over them, and one, written before both our extant letters, dealing with a case of immorality. No group of letters shows so well how thoroughly and intimately Paul understood and handled the individual problems of his churches. He did not 'beat the air.'

The state of the church at Corinth is well known. Paul's long stay in the city was the beginning of a very virile and energetic community, but a community infected with the traditional weaknesses of the Greek spirit.² It was surrounded by the evil of a great cosmopolitan city. It found the struggle against that evil a difficult and exhausting affair. The members of the community seem to have been predominantly from the uneducated classes—'not many wise men (that is, judged by human standards), not many leading men, not many men of good birth, have been called.'³ They were mainly 'Gentiles, who, like those of Thessalonica, expected an immediate return of Jesus Christ. They looked for a miraculous dramatic salvation, not for one by the slower processes of an altered life. What wonder, therefore, if they indulged in the lax morality, the superstitions, the religious disorders to which they had been accustomed since childhood.'⁴ To these men and women Paul presented his arguments for their understanding and persuasion.

Let us take a particular issue—the question of the religious disorders which distressed the community, particularly those features of religious disorder which marked their public

¹ Paul's correspondence with Corinth consisted of at least four letters, two of which have been lost, unless their recovery is possible from the two letters that we have. This is possible. The letter referred to in 1 Cor. v. 9 is supposed by some scholars to have survived in a fragment of the present 'Second Letter' (2 Cor. vi. 14–vii. 1). This would explain its discontinuity. A like argument—but much stronger—would make 2 Cor. x. 1–xiii. 10 into the final letter of rebuke that the Apostle wrote.

² Acts xviii. 1–18.

³ 1 Cor. i. 26.

⁴ B. W. Bacon.

worship.¹ It is evident from the discussion that the public worship of the community was marred by an extravagant indulgence in unintelligible religious ecstasies—'speaking with tongues.' What the exact nature of this phenomenon was we are not certain, but it is evident that it was little more than an uncontrolled babbling which would strike the casual visitor as sheer insanity. This experience was given an importance and prominence that threatened to submerge the calmer and saner aspects of their worship.

How does Paul deal with the matter? He begins by discussing the 'diversities of gifts'² with which the members of the community were endowed. His enumeration of these gifts is instructive: 'the word of wisdom,' 'the word of knowledge,' faith, gifts of healing, workings of miracles, prophecy, discernings of spirits, tongues (the disputed subject), the interpretation of tongues.³ In all these gifts there is an underlying unity—the experience 'of the one Spirit.' 'There are diversities of gifts, but the same Spirit.'⁴ The proposition that Paul lays down is that the supreme experience that gives their various talents significance is the profound spiritual experience common to them all. This experience is not only the foundation of the community, but it is the test by which the value and importance of all practices are to be judged.

This inner unifying experience of the Spirit has certain outward evidences. The community is not a mere group of men and women endowed with diverse gifts—it is a fellowship, in which all members are interdependent and all contribute to the health of the whole. Their fellowship is above racial and religious distinctions. All were 'made to drink of one Spirit.' Here Paul uses his famous illustration of the human body. He is describing not an institution but a fellowship. It is this fellowship which is 'the body of Christ,'

¹ 1 Cor. xii.—xiv.

² *ibid.* xii. 4–11.

³ *ibid.* xii. 8 ff.

⁴ *ibid.* xii. 4.

⁵ *ibid.* xii. 13.

and of which all are 'members each in his part.'¹ Within the fellowship members have different functions—'first apostles, secondly prophets, thirdly teachers, then miracles, gifts of healing, helps, governments, divers kinds of tongues.'² Here Paul specifically states that his order of enumeration is also the order of importance, and it is significant to note that not only does 'speaking with tongues' fall last and therefore least, but that 'governments,' those offices of order which eventually became supreme in the Catholic Church, fall next to the last. The functions of supreme importance are those by which the spiritual experience of God in Jesus Christ is proclaimed and expounded—apostles, prophets, teachers. The reason for this order and these distinctions becomes obvious immediately, for Paul swiftly seizes upon the pre-eminent experience which is the very lifeblood of the community, which is its very *raison d'être*, to which all else is subordinated and for which all else exists: the 'most excellent way' of love.³

This profound spiritual experience—the heart of all that Jesus came to give, the beginning and the end of all Paul's preaching—is the very foundation and ground of all true life. Paul's daring is seen when he seizes a saying of Jesus about faith that could 'remove mountains.'⁴ Even that, he says, is impotent unless it is anchored in this profoundest of all experiences, the love that 'beareth all things, believeth all things, hopeth all things, endureth all things,'⁵ and is greater than faith or hope. It is in the light of this vision that he returns to the question of the religious disorders of Corinth. What are you to think of such a feature of public worship as 'speaking with tongues' in the light of this supreme fact? You can see clearly that it is individual, unintelligible, has no great social consequences for good. Such is his argument. His conclusions are eminently reasonable. He will not

¹ *ibid.* xii. 27.

² *ibid.* xii. 28.

³ *ibid.* xii. 31

⁴ *ibid.* xiii. 2; cf. Mk. xi. 22.

⁵ *ibid.* xiii. 7.

entirely dismiss this experience—for he himself has experiences that are akin to it. But he rates it very low. 'Pray with understanding'¹—there is no obscurantism about Paul. 'In malice be babes, but in mind be men.'² Keep a clear mind—he would have nothing to do with intellectual obscurity—and 'seek to edify.'³ After all, does it or does it not, subserve those high spiritual purposes that as Christians we cherish? Does it deepen that experience of God in Jesus Christ, the visible form of which is love? In the unshared inner experience of the individual it may, but in the fellowship of the community, unless it can be interpreted and made plain to common men, it is a barbarism. 'Wherefore, my brethren,' writes Paul in conclusion, 'desire earnestly to prophesy, and forbid not to speak with tongues.'⁴

One of the great landmarks in the understanding of Paul was erected when it was perceived that the central thing in his view of things was not any particular doctrine, but his conception of what has been called the 'mystical union with Christ,' a conception which was his attempt to interpret the events of his own spiritual career and of the careers of those whom he observed in the various Christian communities. It is this conception which gives meaning to such discussions of his as the one we have analysed above. It is stated with brevity earlier in the same letter—'He who joins himself to the Lord is one with Him in Spirit.'⁵ 'In the context and in this sentence the union must obviously be mystical and not merely ethical.'⁶ The significant thing is, not simply that Paul declared and elaborated this idea, but that he definitely applied it to the everyday life of the communities he established. It was merely the development of the intrinsic Christian experience. He preached it and demanded that nothing less was the real faith. He proclaimed

¹ *ibid.* xiv. 15.

² *ibid.* xiv. 19.

³ *ibid.* xiv. 12.

⁴ *ibid.* xiv. 39.

⁵ *ibid.* vi. 17.

⁶ A. S. Peake, *Peake's Commentary*, in loc.

it to these Corinthians in spite of all he knew about them. He felt that it was the only permanent principle of spiritual health. It was justified by his own experience. It was consonant with all he knew about Jesus. He could speak about the traditions which he had delivered to them. It was in no disagreement with those traditions—it was rather their conclusion.

And we must admit that in the practice of Paul it worked. Men and women responded to it. They left evil ways and reprobate minds, and discovered that they were new creations. We can only reconstruct what they felt in the words of Paul, but we have no reason to doubt that his words represent the truth about them. He was a keen and accurate observer of men. His analyses of spiritual and moral situations and his handling of the practical applications of great principles are masterly achievements. Even to-day his important conclusions have validity and command respect. He did not deceive himself or indulge in patent delusions. He cared too greatly for the truth. Every page of his letters is marked by his passionate loyalty to the truth at all costs. He risked his friendship with his communities in its cause. As we watch him in his letters we can see that he deals with all men on the basis of this one great principle. All his deductions on moral questions are deductions from it. His thoughts of God spring from it as their source. 'For though we walk in the flesh,' he wrote a little later to the same Corinthians, 'we do not war according to the flesh (for the weapons of our warfare are not of the flesh, but mighty before God to the casting down of strongholds); casting down imaginations, and every high thing that is exalted against the knowledge of God, and bringing every thought into captivity to the obedience of Christ.'¹

What was the nature of this experience to which Paul so consistently appealed and which he sought to develop in all his converts and which he assumed was the normal

¹ 2 Cor. x. 4 f.

Christian way, whether he who planted was himself or Apollos or Cephas?

It was obviously and intellectually virile experience. That was clear in Paul's dealing with the phenomenon of 'speaking with tongues.' The whole manner of his approach to the problems of the Corinthian Christians was a reasoned application of first principles—first principles which he intuitively grasped in his own experience but which he also expected his correspondents to find vindicated in their personal experience. He stood for the free and unfettered mind, and the type of experience that was to him fundamental and final was through and through sane and wholesome. He would have little to do with those fantastic and uncontrolled ecstasies that were such a feature of contemporary popular religion. He might not dismiss them entirely, for he himself had experiences of a similar intense and dramatic nature. But they were subordinate. 'The spirits of the prophets are subject to the prophets.'¹ The supreme thing is that sane illuminated life, morally purified and mentally clear and mature, whose roots are deep, 'hidden in God with Christ.'

This experience manifested itself also in certain qualities of life. In his great poem on love these qualities are splendidly set forth. 'Love suffereth long, and is kind; love envieth not; love vaunteth not itself, is not puffed up, doth not behave itself unseemly, seeketh not its own, is not provoked, taketh not account of evil; rejoiceth not in unrighteousness, but rejoiceth with the truth; beareth all things, believeth all things, hopeth all things, endureth all things.'²

In his letter to the Galatians this is clearly laid down. 'The fruit of the Spirit,' he writes, 'is love, joy, peace, long-suffering, kindness, goodness, faithfulness, meekness, self-control.'³ Paul knew that the free and decisive experience that he was preaching was especially open to the charge of antinomianism, a freedom from law that was merely licence. It was a charge made against himself, and followers have

¹ 1 Cor. xiv. 32.

² 1 Cor. xiii. 4 ff.

³ Gal. v. 22 f.

claimed his name in defence of conduct that would have received the stinging lash of his contempt.¹ The experience of God in Jesus Christ, as he understood it, was a free and unfettered life of the Spirit, but it had evident tokens by which it could be discerned. If it did not exhibit the mind of Jesus, if it condoned attitudes and practices that were in contradiction to all that was known about Him, if it did not bring forth 'the fruit of the Spirit,' it was clear whence its origin was. No test was surer to Paul than this ethical test.

There were questions that were of private interpretation. Each man had a right to his own judgement. 'Let each man be fully assured in his own mind.'² But the ethical attitude, which was as much an aspect of the mystical experience as intellectual freedom and integrity, was open to no uncertainty. Not that on specific moral problems it was always clear and unambiguous what a man should do. But the spirit in which Paul approached all issues and determined his relationships with other people was conspicuously observable. 'Have this mind in you which was also in Christ Jesus.'³ Everywhere Paul stressed the inward spirit and rarely the outward decision. 'Concerning this,' he could say, 'I have no commandment of the Lord.'⁴ But of this there is no doubt: 'If any man hath not the Spirit of Christ, he is none of His.'⁵

The fundamental feature of this experience is that it is an inner mystical communion of the soul with the Risen Christ. It is an experience of God mediated by the Spirit. The nature of this inner communion is most clearly exemplified in the experience of Paul himself.

The letters of Paul are, as it were, cross-sections across his mental and spiritual and moral life. We see him dealing with many problems, some ecclesiastical, some moral, some

¹ Cf. the situation that called forth the letter of James.

² Rom. xiv. 5.

³ Phil. ii. 5.

⁴ 1 Cor. vii. 25. cf. v. 7.

⁵ Rom. viii. 9.

spiritual, some philosophical. In the solution of them all he drew his inspiration from this one source. He lives 'in Christ.' When he says that he brings 'every thought into captivity to the obedience of Christ,'¹ he is claiming that there is an intellectual principle which is correlative to his religious experience and is authenticated by it. It is a principle which holds within its ultimate grasp the solution of all the problems that the complex life of man can raise. There is no problem that lies outside its jurisdiction.

It seems to be quite clear that this principle, which is at the basis of Paul's own life and which is the supreme principle of his speculations—not that he completely freed himself from the trammels of his environment and training—is the legitimate development of the life that Jesus lived. It was a great concern of Paul's that he should be true to Jesus Christ, true to His mind and true to His spirit. If we put on one side for the moment his great speculations, and study those cases where he deliberately applies the mind of Jesus to special problems, especially moral and social problems, I believe it to be incontestable to say that on the whole no solutions could be proposed that are nearer to the mind and spirit of Jesus.² His description of love in his Corinthian letter brings Jesus before our eyes. Study his handling of the question of eating meat that had been sold in the markets after having been used in pagan temples. His delicacy of touch, his exquisite understanding of the issues involved, his perfect courtesy, his insight that seizes the principle beneath the complicated circumstance—these things were born of his intimacy with Jesus Christ. The relation of Paul to Jesus is not ultimately a matter of logic

¹ 2 Cor. x. 5.

² 'The fact remains that a portrait of an ideal Christian drawn from material supplied by Paul would not differ in any important feature from a portrait similarly drawn from the teaching of Jesus. Paul may supplement, but he never contradicts his Master. And precisely those features which are most characteristic in the one are those which most distinguish the other.' C. Anderson Scott, *New Testament Ethics*, pp. 75 f.

or theology. The great power of Paul rests finally on this amazing likeness he achieved to the very spirit of his Master, so that in facing situations he came instinctively to act as Jesus Himself would have done. He was indeed 'our beloved brother Paul,' and he wrote and lived 'according to the wisdom given to him,' which was the wisdom of Jesus Christ.¹

Paul is thus of supreme interest to us, not because he is in any way final and authoritative for us, but because he was the first to enunciate with power and genius the great principle which is the only true principle of Christian living. This principle is rooted in personal experience. It is of supreme authority. Its jurisdiction is co-extensive with human experience.

ALAN T. DALE, B.D.

¹ 2 Peter iii. 15.

Sanctions and Treaty Enforcement. By Payson S. Wild, Jr.
(Humphrey Milford. 10s. 6d.)

This volume comes from Harvard University where Dr. Wild is 'Instructor in Government.' The subject was suggested to him by Prof. Wilson who contributes a Foreword on international treaties. Dr. Wild brings the idea of sanctions into an understandable relation to treaty enforcement in six chapters on Sanctions, Sanctity, and Revision; History and Definition of Sanction; International Law and Sanctions; Treaty Sanctions; Implementation; How desirable are Sanctions? The emphasis is placed mainly upon Treaty Sanctions and their practicability; the mode and difficulty of applying such sanctions, and their significance in the philosophy of international law are lightly touched upon. There is no scarcity of material for in the first quarter of this century the United States has signed more than four hundred international agreements which involve a much larger number of States than four hundred. The world's net-work of such agreements is complex in the extreme and the problem of Sanctions is not less complex, and all manner of elements operate to bring about obedience. The whole subject is considered in the light of history. Japanese action in Manchuria, the invasion of Belgium, the Hague Conventions, the Covenant of the League of Nations, the Treaty of Versailles and kindred subjects are discussed with ample knowledge and sound judgement which will commend the work to the close study of legislators and lawyers in all parts of the world.

Notes and Discussions

INTELLIGENCE TESTS AND THE NATIVE BRAIN

IF MENTAL ABILITY could be correctly stated in terms of cranial capacity, then the men of the Neanderthal race ought to have possessed as much culture as there is in this age. No such thing is believed by anybody. Nevertheless, measurements of the capacity of the cranial cortex are widely assumed to provide reliable data for measuring the potential mental ability of any people. It might be argued, of course, that the Neanderthal man hadn't had as much time as this age to develop any potential mental power he possessed.

Whenever this matter is raised to-day, however, the comparison is always made between the European and the African. If the issue were raised, only in order to ascertain the educational curriculum most suited to the African, there would be no reason for complaint. Whenever the discussion is started, however, it usually ends in the insinuation that the African has not the same range of perfectability as has the European. Concern for truth in theory and practice demands that attention shall be paid to that insinuation.

The implication of such insinuations is a white aristocracy of the races. In the conditions which have now established themselves in racial relationships, such an assumption is an affront to all who happen not to be born white. As representatives of the Christian faith, and chief custodians of it, such a caricature of the faith cannot be countenanced, unless it should prove incontrovertible.

It is easy to grow the superiority complex when living among Africans in their native places. To witness daily their primitive mode of life, their contentment with dirt and discomfort, their disregard of what are to us the most elementary rules of hygiene, and to witness all this and more until one ceases to notice it; well, by that time the superiority complex is fully established in the white man's mind.

To those who have not had first hand experience the films go far in supplying what is needful. Film producers try to get the nearest possible to the untouched savage. Vast audiences of white folk see the native on the screen, his habits and dress (some of them), at home, at food, at play and at war. Before many years pass some of these films will have become valuable historical documents. As African peoples are swept into the stream of European civilization the possibility of repeating such films except by invention becomes more and more remote. The tribes are vanishing. These pictures, however, can do no other than stimulate the growth in the white audiences of the superiority complex. It insinuates itself into the mind. As an offset to this superiority complex it is good to keep in mind that the existing world situation, as created by the white man's intelligence,

is hardly a boast-worthy creation. This phase of our own particular problem and responsibility ought to make us careful with the words we use about intelligence tests anywhere. There is considerable agreement that another European war would be the end of civilization, as we know it. That such a possibility should seriously jeopardize the world belies all insinuations about our racial intellectual superiority. The real inferiority complex of the African cannot be ignored in this discussion. Nothing fits man for responsibility like responsibility. Wherever white supremacy has been asserted the African has been born to the slave mind. He has been reared in an atmosphere in which it was only expected of him to be content with life as his people had always lived it. While for him to have aspiration was preposterous. Such birth and mental climate are an immeasurable handicap.

From their earliest days white children breathe the atmosphere of enterprise. They are encouraged to believe that every door is open to them if only they prove their ability and worth. That influence explains why young men from England's homes, even as very young men, have gone out to the successful administration of vast areas of thickly populated Colonial territory. All such incentive is absent from the life of the native youth. It is no argument to state that he hasn't yet arrived at that stage. The point here named is pertinent. In an atmosphere, where ambition has been regarded as a presumption, and application and ardour benumbed and frozen as being altogether improper, there have arisen many who have revealed great possibilities for leadership, who have compelled acknowledgement, and though it has been grudgingly given they have established themselves as capable and trustworthy.

A true test of intelligence does not concern itself only with the heights achieved and the distinctions won. It relates these things to the lowliness from which the start was made, the quality of the ancestry, the meagreness of opportunity, the atmosphere in which growth had to be made, and the repressions which had to be overcome.

Dr. H. L. Gordon, of Nairobi, in a letter to *The Times* of December 8, 1933, states that 'the native curve of brain capacity ends practically where the European begins.' This may be quite true. Allowance must surely be made, however, for the fact already named, viz., when young native men should be rising to the sense of their own worth, and developing the conscious determination to carve for themselves a career of honourable distinction, at that very period native youth, for the most part, must be awakening to the unpleasant truth that such ambition in a black man is quite preposterous, and a place of distinction for him is not to be expected, except it be in crime. It is at least open to the honest question, whether this factor does not account very largely for the disparity revealed in Dr. Gordon's graph. It also applies as a possible explanation of the assertions in the same letter which read: 'From ten to twenty the average yearly growth is 17.7 c.c. for the European and 8.5 c.c.

for the native. Further, though both brains increase until the age of puberty, after that age the curve for the European rises steeply, whereas the curve for the native scarcely rises at all.' It may indeed be that 'that further knowledge why the native brain does not increase after puberty,' which the letter referred to deems desirable, would largely be available, if more equal opportunities were ungrudgingly afforded the native youth at the formative period of his life, so far as vocation were concerned.

Two points worthy of note are made in this connexion by L. S. B. Leakey, Fellow of St. John's, Cambridge. A possible additional factor why the native brain does not increase after puberty is probably the fact that sex life begins for natives in normal native life as soon as puberty is reached. This contention seems to be confirmed by the fact, that when natives remain in close association with the Mission Station, which has furnished them with their education, and the inspiration for their life, they reveal no such disparity as is revealed for the average. Their development is not retarded at that age in any way whatever.

The stronger point made by Mr. Leakey is, however, that many males of the Neanderthal race, and most of the males of the Stone Age and the Upper Paleolithic period had a very high brain capacity, yet that is not regarded as evidence that they had greater mental ability than modern man. This scholar declares he 'Is inclined to believe that there is no correlation between brain capacity, measured in terms of cubic centimetres, and actual or potential mental ability,' and he quotes Sir Arthur Keith as saying, 'Size of brain is a very imperfect index of mental ability.'

The most devastating logic is supplied by J. B. S. Haldane, of London University, in the following manner. Though the average cranial capacity of 3,400 Africans proved to be only 1.316 c.c. while that of Europeans is 1.483, what inference is to be made, when it is realized that similar measurements for a group of Eskimos was 1.563 c.c.? Does it mean that a thorough-going Eskimo culture would be altogether more than Europeans could endure? None would put that construction on the revealed disparity between Eskimo and European, yet that is precisely what is done when the figures of measurements relate to European and African.

This wider comparison of measurements may indicate, however, that the influence of climate is a factor in the measurements of cranial capacity which has not been sufficiently taken into account. Furthermore, the disparity between the masculine and feminine cranial cortices of normal Europeans seems to be well established. He would be a daring teacher who ventured to assert, in face of available evidence, that the disparity indicates a different potentiality for mental achievement. Such assertion would hardly be a contribution to truth.

Intelligence tests made from the peculiar development of one race, but meant to be applied to all races, are themselves open to suspicion. It is frequently stated by travellers through the Congo forests that

they are conscious of being watched all the way by the Pigmies, and yet they most rarely catch sight of any representative of those diminutive folk. An intelligence test, from the Pigmy angle, would probably result in labelling the European traveller as a member of a race which had not sufficient gumption to take ordinary care of itself. Furthermore, though African races have not been switched on to the line of evolution which has resulted in mechanical inventiveness, it will tend to correct conceit in us to remember that only lately have we arrived at that development. It is not long since Darwin placed in our hands the key which opened so many doors of progress. The ancient Babylonians possessed stamps for marking their pottery. The names of owners of brickfields of 4,000 years ago have recently become known. Why the long interval until Caxton combined similar stamps into type and the issuing of print? The copying of documents for all those centuries must have been laborious enough to have stimulated earlier the invention of printing. Really we are not so far from the times of great ignorance, among the majority of white people, that we can afford to forget it in our examination of the ignorance of others.

The principle at stake in all these intelligence tests is a matter of paramount importance. Many are dismayed at the anti-Jewish attitude so vigorously pursued in Germany during recent months. It is a return to the manners of the Middle Ages. It is an outrage on many members of that Semitic race which has made superlative contributions to the knowledge of the world. This is no place to discuss the politics of the Fatherland. But to say we are amazed is to state the matter with the utmost restraint. The world aristocracy of the white race is a dangerous doctrine to teach. The fundamental supremacy of one section of the white race, that doubtful Nordic section, however flattering it may appear to some, is to be sternly resisted. For since the earth is becoming increasingly a village, it requires vivid imagination and considerable credulity to reach assurance as to where this master race, in its virile purity, is now to be found. It is indeed pertinent to point out that some of those, whose contributions to world values are most highly prized, in religion and statesmanship, in literature and science and art and social service, have come of very mixed but wholesome stock. A lecturer recently asserted that the late Lord Birkenhead had in him strong gipsy strain, and a member of the family declared that he was proud of it. It may be worth naming, also, that the British people have made a most praiseworthy contribution to the well-being of humanity, when that contribution is set in the light of the popular thought and world-conditions prevailing at any particular period. But pure British is a very mixed pedigree.

The true basis for intelligence tests seems to be, not response made to methods which have on them the patent number, nor the measurements of the cranial cortexes, but the response made to situations which have on them the hall mark of reality. This alone is the test which escapes the perfectly just criticism, that it is unjust to test an

African with devices which might be reasonably suitable for the testing of a Frenchman or American or Englishman.

It has already been hinted that native races which live by hunting, can teach the most informed European tricks when it comes to stalking game. Which indicates to the unprejudiced student that the proper intelligence test for the African, if test there must be, ought to be devised by a competent research worker who himself 'thinks black'—an almost impossible achievement for a white man.

The laboratory for research on these issues is life. Here it is discovered that cases are not so rare of men who have come from the bottom up, and who have scaled heights which leave the average white man, with his more spacious opportunities, far behind. If all such have not risen from slavery to leadership and distinction, they have risen, and that against the rising tide of the white man's repressions. They may not all have become Booker Washingtons or Aggreys, but every white resident among African folk has met men of their quality. Intelligence tests will reach safest results when the colour of a man's skin is nowhere the brand of inferiority, nor a weapon for humiliation, and insult, but when every man of whatever colour has everywhere a fair field of opportunity. The creation of this condition universally challenges the resources of the whole Church of God.

HAROLD OGDEN.

MODERNISM

THE September Conferences of the Modern Churchmen's Union serve to keep in our minds the idea of modernity or modernism in Religion as something living and vigorous. The members of that Union number among them some of the ablest thinkers in the Church of England to-day; and it might well be thought that they provide a home, in the hospitable bosom of Anglicanism, for ideas and aims which Rome finally and definitely expelled some twenty-five years ago. This is true enough, if we give a sufficiently wide connotation to the term. It may be used broadly, and ambiguously, to include Harnack and Dean Inge, and even Newman and Duchesne. But to bring writers of such widely divergent views and attitudes under one name is to overlook very important differences; and it is only when these differences are borne in mind that the men themselves can be understood. Comparison must pass into contrast before we can rightly estimate the purpose or the value of Loisy and Tyrrell, of Von Hügel or the Modern Churchmen.

All this has been very clearly brought out in the important book on Modernism just published by Mr. A. R. Vidler—*The Modernist Movement in the Roman Church* (Cambridge University Press. 12s. 6d.). The title indeed might be taken to imply the existence of a modernist movement *outside* the Roman Church; but this Mr. Vidler denies; modernism, properly speaking, he claims, has no existence outside Rome. Even within that Church, it formed no school or party; it had no programme; it published no manifesto; and the leaders, if

such a term can be properly used of them, were more numerous than the rank and file. Such at least is the impression of Mr. Vidler's book. He gives far more space to Loisy and Tyrrell than to all the rest (for this the reader will probably thank him); on a lower level stand Alfred Fawkes and Baron von Hügel and Miss Petre, in England, Le Roy and Laberthonnière in France, Döllinger, and (much later) Heiler, in Germany; and when we have done with these, the rest can be disposed of in a few pages. The strength of modernism did not rest in its numbers; had it not been for the brilliance and the skill of Loisy and Tyrrell, modernism (in Mr. Vidler's sense) might never have been heard of. So far indeed are we from being able to gather both Protestants and Catholics under the term, that one of Loisy's most important books, *The Gospel and the Church*, was written primarily as an answer to Harnack's *What is Christianity?* Loisy held that it was possible for him to be a Catholic, till Rome expelled him. Nothing would ever have made him think that he could be a Protestant.

What then was the difference between these two types of progressive thought? The modernists had been brought up in the Catholic Church. This, indeed, is not strictly true of Tyrrell; yet Tyrrell's intellectual life did not properly begin till he had become a Jesuit. They believed that the Church had been founded by Christ, and, in its main features, fixed by Him. The ministry was His gift to the Church, the channel of redeeming and absolving grace; and the sacraments were the divinely appointed means for the approach of the worshipper to the Redeemer—means which of course required the priest for their due employment. With all this, a Protestant, or at all events a liberal Protestant, of the type of Harnack or Hatch, could have nothing to do. To him, the Catholic Church was a product of the Hellenisation of the original, and far simpler society left by Jesus and described in the Acts. Neither ministry nor sacraments, save in their simplest and quite un-Catholic form, could claim any divine authority. Again, the modernists recognized a definite body of teaching as committed by Christ to the Church. It came from above, not from below. It was a *depositum fidei*. This, too, is the Catholic doctrine. Every paragraph in Harnack's book shows that he could never have accepted it. The point at which Loisy broke with the Church was his assertion that the doctrines of the Church must be modifiable by historical and literary criticism. This assertion Mr. Vidler regards as the heart of modernism. It was central with Loisy; he would never give it up. Loisy indeed was a *savant* rather than a theologian. He could never, Mr. Vidler reminds us, be brought to see the importance of the doctrine of the immanence or transcendence of God, or of immortality. What was the evidence for the authorship of the Fourth Gospel, or for the events related in the Acts? Such were the questions that engrossed him; and when Rome refused to allow him to put them, and told him that the answers had been determined already, quite apart from the considerations that weighed with his scholarly mind, he knew that the break must come.

His attitude has been compared to that of Newman. Both have been called evolutionists in doctrine. But Newman would have been as horrified as was Pio Nono at modernism. In the first place, Newman had no real interest in the historical and critical questions that meant everything to Loisy; they had hardly become pressing till his later days. In the second, his idea of development is quite other than that of Loisy. 'Time is necessary,' he says, 'for the full comprehension and perfection of great ideas'; the highest ideas, though given to man in the Primitive Church, can only be elucidated after deeper thought and longer exposition. It will also be observed that neither have anything to do with evolution in the popular or Darwinian sense of the word.

Loisy was the *savant*; and when the Church condemned him, he became a *savant laïque*, and so he has since remained. Tyrrell's allegiance to his Church had a more personal character than Loisy's. For him, devotion to the Church and to truth were inseparable. Mr. Vidler points out that he had read Matthew Arnold; he is nearer in disposition, and in destiny, to Clough. He, too, might have written

It fortifies my soul to know

That though I perish, truth is so.

'Loisy,' observed an acute Frenchman, 'would say, "If Rome does not want me, I will go"; Tyrrell would say, "Whether Rome wants me or not, I shall not go."' Mr. Vidler sketches, in some detail, the story of the advance of his thought, emphasizing the part which Baron von Hügel played in it. No reader of Miss Petre's biography will forget the tragedy of the struggle into which intercourse with von Hügel led him, nor the passionate insistence that faith (rather than, with Loisy, history) was everything. To him, the *lex orandi* was the true *lex credendi*. This might sound like pragmatism; Mr. Vidler is not unready to admit the impeachment. But it was more. To Tyrrell, no doctrine could be worth anything that could not be framed into a prayer, or a hymn; on the other hand, whatever brings us nearer to God must have on it the stamp of truth; what else could truth be, than that which enables us to approach to the Truth? Rome could not break Loisy; he is with us still, vigorous as ever. Von Hügel, voyaging into less perilous seas, did not allow Rome to break him. It broke the delicate soul of Tyrrell. Rome held its thunders till 1907, when the decree *Lamentabili* and the encyclical *Pascendi* appeared; followed by the imposition of the anti-modernist oath on all priests and teachers. But that last blow could not touch him. He had passed away in July, 1909.

Modernism, in its narrower sense, no longer exists. It could not survive the oath imposed in 1910, which Rome has continued to exact, save (doubtless for excellent reasons) from Professors in German Catholic Universities. Her action has been as successful as it was relentless. The reason for this success is easy to see. The decree of Papal Infallibility of 1870 had been received with delight over a great part of the Catholic world; most of the Catholic leaders were quite out of touch, by their education and their environment, with historical

criticism; and it needed a brave man to stand up to the denunciation of Rome; while at the same time, Rome did not make her pronouncement till she was sure of a majority.

But why should all historical and literary criticism have been thus condemned? Did not such a step involve an absurdity and a recklessness beyond what is customary even for Rome? On the contrary, nothing else was really possible. Rome has always allowed freedom till the Curia or the Pope has spoken. And on certain subjects neither will speak. But Rome holds herself to be the guardian of the faith. On what she considers necessary to salvation, either truths or institutions, she can tolerate no rival and no question. On these matters, private judgement is folly; for it means ruin for the soul; and it is impiety, for it is defiance of Christ and of His spokesman and vicegerent on earth. Thus, while one discusses mysticism or the essential elements in eternal life, like von Hügel, one is safe; or even if one criticizes the outworks of the Papacy while defending the centre, as Acton was understood to be doing. But to subject the verbal infallibility of the Bible (which is much more a Romanist than a Protestant doctrine) to the theories and guesses of Protestant scholars in Germany would cut at the root of Papal authority. Thus, although modernism might view liberal Protestantism with fear and suspicion, Rome was bound to regard both with equal hostility. And she would perhaps have been excusable if she saw in the modernists, what they would have repudiated, traces of the detested liberalism and the 'march of mind.' Protestants and modernists alike claimed to alter and modify her *depositum*. But while the barristers might plead at length before her, the judge alone could decide and make the law; and from his sentence there could be no appeal.

Strange to say, with vast numbers of even intelligent persons, this claim causes neither protest nor surprise. Nearly a hundred years ago, Bishop Ullathorne told the Catholic laity of England that it was theirs to hunt and entertain and contribute to the Church; other matters they must leave to their betters; and they were quite content. In more than half the religious world, as over a large part of the political world of to-day, Dostoevsky's famous parable of the Grand Inquisitor would be taken, not as a satire or a condemnation, but as a very satisfactory defence of autocracy. Men do not wish to have to think for themselves. They are quite satisfied that, as a critic has wittily remarked, only the Pope has really the right to turn modernist. Rome has been the enigma, the admiration, and the despair of the centuries, even before the Reformation. How could it be otherwise when she could find a home for the Bishop who ordered his tomb in St. Praxed's Church, and the Pope who had to condemn Guido Franceschini to death? She has spoken glorious things of Christ in her day; she has brought peace and compassion to the penitent. But she has always insisted in standing between the two and, as she forced the modernists to recognize, she has always claimed to speak the last word—to each of them.

W. F. LOFTHOUSE, M.A., D.D.

I BELIEVE IN GOD

(This note is written by a Methodist Minister in Norway who had studied in the Union Scandinavian School of Theology at Gothenburg and graduated in the history of religion. He is now preparing for his M.A. degree. The note has added interest in view of these facts.—ED.)

BOTH the history of religion and the religious mind speak to us about another and higher world or reality than that we commonly are in touch with. This is a matter of fact which we cannot ignore. But here we are to meet a question which is of fundamental kind: Is this religious and higher reality only an illusion or is it objective? Religion itself does not create unbelief in our hearts, but the modern man is listening also to the scientists. Does science deny religion? We will here let the psychologists represent the sciences.

Some years ago, J. B. Pratt said that the psychology of religion only had to study the religious consciousness (*The Religious Consciousness*, p. 31), but now it is not so. He meant that God could not in the common way be an object for studies. The psychologists only had to study our religious experiences and behaviour. So, also, meant Harald Høffding (*Religionsfilosofi*, p. 98). In the study of religion he found it best to concentrate upon the experiences. But in the later days many of the psychologists have tried to conclude their studies with philosophical postulates. Indeed this is all right, but it is necessary to keep a clear line between what is science and what are philosophical postulates.

To-day the theory of illusion is widespread among the psychologists. By studying the function of the religious consciousness they have come to the conclusion that religion is a natural product of this function. They think they can explain religion without accepting the idea of God. Religious people have enabled themselves and each other to believe in God. God and everything belonging to the higher world of religion has no objective reality to the psychologist. And that means God does not exist.

For psychologists the theory of illusions is mostly grounded in the theory of projection. There are several types of this theory, but they are all built on the same premises. Josey means by the projective mechanism the tendency to find in the external world just what harmonizes with our subjective thoughts, feelings, &c. B. H. Streeter formulates his words in the following way: 'It is often said that belief in God is to be explained as a projection upon the universe of the child's craving for a parent's protection, or of its passionate yearning for affection, surviving in the adult in a repressed form.' (*Reality*, p. 274.)

Feuerbach's theory of religion was of that type. 'My theory is in few words this: Theology is anthropology. In the object of religion which we call God, we cannot find more than is in man himself.' For a great deal this cannot be denied. Modern psychology tells us that

our relationship to the external world is determined by our own complexes. In a chapter called 'Projection and Idealism' Tansley tries to show that in the primitive world man projects parts of his own personality on nature-forces and so creates gods. But modern psychology goes farther. It has also tried to show that God Himself, and not only His characteristics, is a result of projection. Most remarkable are the thoughts of Sigmund Freud outlined in his books, *Totem und Tabu*, and *Die Zukunft einer illusion*. If now these projection theories are what they are said to be, it is clear that religion must be an illusion. They deny God, which is the phenomenological ground for our belief. No God means no religion. But there seem to be several objections. In dealing with Freud's theories in *Das Wesen der Religion* Wobbermin makes a remarkable objection. Freud has tried to show that in the religion of the primitive peoples the totem is a surrogate for the father, which is made god-like. And here remarks Wobbermin: "Very fine. The god-like-making helps us to understand the god-thought. It is a declaration of the same kind as Uncle Bräsig's by Reuter: "From where comes all the pauperism?—Yes, from all the poverty.""

Another objection, also remarkable, is this: The theory of projection must accept an object to which the projection can be done. By the primitive people this object can be a totem, and by the cultivated perhaps the universe. Jesus taught His disciples to project the father-thought on God, but God was the beforehand-being object. Religion always has its object, and so it is another question if this object is such an one as religion thinks it to be. Then this is our result: If the theory of projection ends by saying that the higher world of religion is an illusion, then it also has gone over from exact science to philosophical postulate. So the postulate of psychology stands contra to the postulate of religion.

Several scientists have meant that sense-experiences should prove the truth of religion. This must be right, inasmuch as all science builds on experience. We must believe in the correct registering of our senses. Sometimes we afterwards can understand that we had misinterpreted them, but also such conclusions have their ground in the confidence of the same senses. It seems to me that many of the scientists have forgotten this simple truth, especially when studying religion. The human mind is the same in all the relations of life. It is not quite right to speak about the religious consciousness, it is better to speak about a consciousness which has become religious. The consciousness is always the same, but its functions are different. Re-thinking this we can understand that empirical points of view very well may be used also in the study of religion. The scientists have to listen to the religious mind which is speaking about its experiences.

On the other side: If the higher world, which the religious man tells us about as a matter of fact, was objective and real, then it should be possible to prove this for everybody. Here we meet a new difficulty. The religious experience is a proof only for the religious mind. But here, says Mudge (*The God-Experience*, p. 11), we must remember there

are two kinds of experiences. We first have the type of senses which is directed on the external, and then we have the inner senses. For Mudge, this last mentioned is a fact connected with our feeling-reactions. Henri Bergson tells us that intellectually we can only grasp the matter from the outside. But by intuition we can understand and grasp the matter from the inner side. And intuition for him is 'an instinct that has become disinterested, self-conscious, capable of reflecting upon its object and of enlarging it indefinitely.' (*Creative Evolution*, p. 186.) He further means that intuition specially works in the arts and in religion. But when thinking on this we must remember that the two kinds of experience are connected with the same human mind and that they both operate in the sciences as well as in religion. There exists no special kind of experience for religion. 'It is quite true that there is no particular tear-gland for religion, nor a special heart-beat to express our contact with God.' (Rattenbury.) The proof of religion cannot be grounded in the human consciousness. It is our mind which registers the experiences of what kind they may be, whether material or spiritual. The proof of religion can only be found in the quality of the experience. We find the proof in religion itself—especially in the thought of transcendence.

Can science then say nothing about the reality of the higher world of which religion speaks to us? If we are asking for a proof for the reality of that world, the answer is 'no.' But modern science tells us another remarkable thing: Our experience will lead us to the problem of religion. Science will raise for us a question, but cannot itself give the answer. I quote what Carl Stange says about this matter: 'When we are working with the sense-experiences to make them reasonable for us, we will come to the point where we have to face the problem of religion.' The Swedish theologian, Anders Nygren, also quotes these words in his book about the *a priori* of religion and gives them his sanction.

We believe in God, and in the higher reality about which religion speaks to us. And there seems to be something in modern psychology which forbids us to believe and trust in that world as a matter of fact.

Oslo, Norway.

ODD HAGEN.

COLUMBANUS, MONK AND MISSIONARY

THE IRISH CHURCH of the sixth century not only sent missionary monks to evangelize Scotland and England, but also France, Switzerland, Italy, &c. Columbanus is the greatest of these missionaries to the Continent. His life story, told by Jonas, a monk of Bobbio, and a contemporary, and some of his letters and sermons, and his celebrated 'Rule' are preserved, so that we can form a very clear conception of the man and his work.

He was born in Leinster, A.D. 543. He resisted the insidious perils of youth, and ever yearned for the religious life, which to him meant 'taking up the cross to follow Jesus.' He abandoned his home, passing

over the prostrate form of his mother on the threshold, turned aside from marriage and earthly loves, and, after attending school at Lake Erne, studied under St. Comgall at Bangor. He became proficient in secular as well as divine studies, in rhetoric, grammar, the classics, both Greek and Latin, and above all, in the study of the Fathers and in the Bible, which was always to him the supreme authoritative standard. After a time, along with twelve disciples, he left his native land never to return. After a brief stay in Britain he went forward to France, 'a pilgrim for the sake of Jesus Christ.'

France was divided into three or four kingdoms, ruled by princes of the Merovingian dynasty of the invading Franks, who had established themselves on the ruins of the Roman power. The Roman Empire, in its decline, does not escape criticism, but the passing of that brilliant culture and ordered government and city life, and the substitution for it of the irresponsible brutal despotism of the Franks reminds us forcibly, that all history is not progress, and that the history of civilization reveals strange and terrible periods of degeneration and reaction.

Gregory of Tours has shown only too clearly the general decline of social life and the evil character of the rulers. A faint veneer of Christian profession barely conceals the essential barbarism of those days. Only the Church continued to possess some degree of Roman culture, but it is only too evident that the Church did not escape the general corruption.

Columbanus was favourably received by Sigibert, who reigned over the eastern kingdom, called Austrasia, and he was permitted to found, in the course of the years, monastic settlements at Anegray, Luxueil and Fontaines. The ruins of an old fort at Anegray and some ruined baths, covered by dense foliage, near some hot springs at Luxueil showed something of the past glory of Rome, rapidly becoming a mere memory of what it had been.

Life at first was very rough. The monks had to live on the bark of trees, wild berries from the woods, and but for the kindly intervention of certain interested neighbours they would have died of starvation. However, they were prepared for hard work, and by ploughing, sowing and reaping they brought land under cultivation, and lived on what they produced. They lived together bound by hard rules, in which even the failure to say 'Amen' or the use of the word 'mine' instead of 'ours' were visited with penalties. There was little sleep, much silence, constant attendance at daily and nightly services, manual labour, and a very frugal vegetarian diet with a little fish. They had all things in common, living as a family under their Abbot.

Sigibert died by the hand of an assassin, and the history of France for some years is the terrible record of the fierce hatred of two queens, Fredegonde and Brunehilde, widows of the two brothers Chilperic and Sigibert. Some years passed. Lothaire, son of Fredegonde and Chilperic, is now ruling over the western kingdom called Neustria, which included Paris and Soissons, whilst Theodoric and Theodebert,

under the direction of their grandmother Brunehilde, rule over Austrasia and Burgundy—three young men always at enmity with each other.

Columbanus rebuked Theodoric for his immoral life, refused to bless his illegitimate children, refused the king's offered hospitality, and rebuked him for seeking to enter monastic precincts. Brunehilde urged her grandson to expel the daring monk.

There was another reason for expulsion. Columbanus had been in correspondence and controversy with the Pope and the Gallican Church over the date of Easter and his own monastic rules. He maintained his adherence to the old Irish date for Easter, and refused to accept the authority of the bishop of the diocese in which his monasteries were founded. His claim was similar to that made by Francis of Assisi and Wesley in later days who said, 'the World is my parish.'

Columbanus was therefore expelled from the kingdom, and was eventually put on a boat on the Loire, at Nantes, which was to sail to Ireland. However, the ship grounded on sand banks in the river, and in the confusion he was allowed quietly to walk away into freedom. Instead of proceeding to Ireland, he turned to the court of young Lothaire, who seems to have established for himself the reputation of being perhaps the best of the Merovingians, and certainly he was well disposed to the Irish monks, listened to their exhortations and rebukes, and welcomed them to his kingdom. Ever restless, however, Columbanus passed on to Metz; then we find him by Lake Constance, and at last he crossed the Alps to Italy and received from the hands of Agilulf, the king of the Lombards, who had conquered North Italy, some land at Bobbio, which was his last foundation, where he died two years later. Meanwhile his monks flourished exceedingly at their respective settlements, and became powerful factors in the renewal of the religious life of France.

Columbanus is well worth consideration. He was a monk bound by monastic vows, but he was a missionary with a gospel to preach. He worked with his hands in the fields, but he was a learned man who could use his pen to advantage. He could speak with the severity of Old Testament prophets, and denounce kings, but he grasped firmly the principles of the Sermon on the Mount. He was a great teacher of men, but a very humble follower of his Lord. He was certainly feared but he was also greatly loved.

We notice his *extraordinary independence of spirit*. The Bible, Jesus, and the word of God in his own heart were to him the authority. He spoke, for example, of the Roman See with very great reverence. It was to him the principal See, the head of all the Churches. The Pope was the successor of Peter, to whom the keys had been given, and at Rome were the ashes of the apostles. Yet in spite of these words of praise he refused to accept the Pope's word when that disagreed with Irish customs and his own convictions. He told Pope Gregory not to follow blindly the customs of his predecessor, Leo—'a living dog is better than a dead lion,' was his rather curious way of rejecting the infallibility of the dead Pope. He told another Pope, Boniface, that his authority as keybearer, opening and

shutting the gates of the Kingdom, depended on the right use of his prerogative, and the true confession of faith ceased to operate when right reason or correct doctrine was missing. Columbanus challenged him to establish his orthodoxy, in view of the suspicion of favouring heresy, and hints at the possibility that a Pope might be a heretic. There is no Papal infallibility here.

Columbanus also *preserved his independence of the diocesan episcopate*. We possess his pathetic appeal to be allowed to remain in silence in those solitudes where he and his monks had lived for twelve years, where seventeen of their companions were buried. He claimed to have come to those parts for the sake of Christ Jesus, and begged that, in spite of differences in certain customs, they might have peace and charity in the service of the common Lord and engage in mutual prayers for each other. But however humble the address, there is no suggestion of yielding to the authority of the bishops assembled in Council.

There should be free discussion, and that only should be received which was in agreement with the Old and New Testaments. Here the Bible is placed above the Church Council in order of value. He was a pilgrim for Christ's sake, nothing can be substituted for that Call. Columbanus evidently asserts here the right of a private judgement in the name of Christ, who has called him, and resists the authority of Pope and the Gallican Church Council.

Moreover, his *independence over against the State*, represented by these Merovingian princes, was important. He rebuked these kings for their private vices and in the name of God called on them to repent. These are the protests of a free spirit anticipating the Puritan and democratic protests of later days. In this assertion of a moral, spiritual authority, over and above that of secular authority of the State, there is a definite limitation on despotic tyranny and irresponsible power.

It surely was a good thing to know in those days that kings were responsible to God for their deeds, and that above these Merovingian tribunals, where justice was bought, sold or denied altogether, there was the august tribunal of God.

Columbanus rendered *great service to civilization* when he brought back into the savage life of the Franks the knowledge of the Classics, the old culture of the schools, and introduced, by his own example and teaching, a genuine respect for honest manual labour and constructive work on the land. Work with brain and hand in school and on the land showed the way to a better ordered social life.

But it must not be forgotten that all this is rooted deep in a *personal religion*. Columbanus and his monks were deeply religious men, passionate lovers of their Saviour Lord. Think of his prayers addressed often to Jesus and the intimacy of the language used—'Our Jesus,' 'My Jesus,' 'Our Saviour,' 'My Lord,' sufficiently indicate the intensity of the experience. 'O Lord Christ thou art our light, our salvation, our food and our drink,' 'O most loved Saviour most sweet to us, we ask that we may love Thee above all, that we may desire Thee alone.

We ask for nothing but Thee and pray that our love may be fixed on Thee alone.' There is a very definite religious experience expressed in these words. They had a gospel to preach. It was the gospel of the grace of God 'anticipating, initiating, consummating' all human effort. All are unworthy of salvation and all have sinned. Only by confidence in God alone can salvation be found. There is no room for pride, only for humble trust in God's mercy. The Cross of Jesus is constantly emphasized. No theory of atonement is found here, but 'the Creator died for the impious, the Lord for the servant and God for man.' It was to these men a revelation of God's grace and it represented an example of humility for all Christians to follow.

The Sermon on the Mount is constantly quoted as authoritative. Humility, patience, unselfishness are virtues to be cultivated; avarice, covetousness, envy, jealousy are vices to be rejected. Love is the one law which covers all for 'there is nothing dearer to God than love.' The value of the common life is seen. This is the only way to overcome covetousness, for private property was a source of vast evil in the opinion of these monks; all selfish individualism is rejected. Again and again they reject a merely external life of outward penance, and plead for interior virtues of a loving heart and trusting humble mind. The Lord's Supper is treated quite spiritually in one of these sermons. To eat the flesh and drink the blood is to love and obey Jesus.

Columbanus and his monks were *puritan* in their spiritual and ethical view of religion, and like the Puritans their view of life was both sacred and solemn. Beyond this life there is eternity, and this life is only the way to true life. Here we are but pilgrims, there is the true home because there is our Father. Eternity is ever in their thoughts. To them it is utter folly and blindness to forget the everlasting rewards and penalties of the judgement, which some day must be faced. So temporal affairs, however important in themselves, are really only important because all events in this life have eternal value.

Such a man was Columbanus. They tell of miracles. The rock yields water to his touch, people are healed of diseases, wild beasts become tame, predictions become true. There is awe, mystery and wonder in these narratives, for he was a very great man, and he profoundly influenced his monks by his character. Perhaps we could find other explanations for some of these reported miracles, but his greatness is found in his utter surrender to a divine calling, his acceptance of the way of the Cross, his intense devotion to Jesus, the Saviour 'most sweet and beloved.' Like Paul he said, 'I am crucified with Christ' and 'nothing can separate me from the love of Christ.' There lies the secret of his power, he lived in union with Christ.

DOUGLAS W. LOWIS, D.D.

LITERATURE AND THE PROBLEM OF CHANGE

THERE are few minds that have reflected at all but face the problem whether the world is one or many. Can the universe be reduced to one essential essence, or is this a pluralistic universe made up of various essences? If the universe is made up of a number of things, can these various things be reconciled into a unity? This problem, like all others, is reflected in literature. We find many writers, whether conscious of the problem or not, taking different attitudes toward it and suggesting different adjustments of the individual to the problem.

In Edwin Arnold we have an example of the mystic method of meeting the situation. As the mystic looks out upon the world of diversity and conflict there is but one solution for him and that is by identifying himself with the One—God. To become identified with God it is necessary that there shall be a negation of man. The individual must sink himself into the Whole. He may lose his individuality—or rather find his individuality—in the life of union with God. Get rid of what distinguishes you; the differences are but illusions. Purge yourself. Get rid of appearances. This is the release from change and multiplicity. An elaborate system is devised for that end which finds classical expression in the literature of the Upanishads. It is this spirit of mysticism and Buddhism that Arnold gives us in his poem, 'The Light of Asia.'

The aching craze to live ends—and life glides—
Lifeless—to nameless quiet—nameless joy,
Blessed Nirvana—sinless, stirless rest,—
That change which never changes.—(Book VI).

It would be possible to quote extensively from the poem in illustration of this mystic solution, but we leave Arnold with the following quotation:

If ye lay bound upon the wheel of change,
And no way were of breaking from the chain,
The heart of boundless Being is a curse,
The Soul of Things fell pain.

Ye are not bound! the Soul of Things is sweet,
The Heart of Being is celestial rest;
Stronger than woe is will: that which was good
Doth pass to Better—Best.—(Book VIII).

Somewhat akin to this attitude is expressed by Wordsworth, as in 'Intimations of Immortality.' The poem has an 'other-worldly' atmosphere. Instead of concerning ourselves with this life, we are reminded of another life and an existence to come. In all the changes of life, that which shall bring us encouragement is the thought that man must live after death because he lived before he was born, an argument as old as Plato. The poet tells us that a peculiar glamour and beauty surrounded the world when he was young, due to the intuitive recollections that could only be explained as the recollections of a former life. As life progressed these wore away and brought with

it regret. But the life that is visible in the great world of Nature about us is a part of the life that we share and the sustaining thought must be that we shall return again to that existence. Once, we drew from out the vast. What does the brief existence of a few years and its changes really matter? We shall return to the vast once again. There is a real world behind this world and we can best adjust ourselves to the problem of change by keeping the emphasis on that world to which we go. As with Edgar Allan Poe in *The Raven*, there is the tendency to idealize the past that can never be recovered.

When we turn to the poet-philosopher Omar Khayyám we meet with a decided world weariness. One might quote from the poem at random in illustration. There is no use in seeking after any meaning in life. It is held in the meshes of a rigid destiny. The one thing to do is to extract from our brief life all the pleasure it can bring to us. The one relentless fact of existence is change that at last hurries all into the shadow of death.

In direct contrast to what has been cited is Robert Browning. In 'Rabbi Ben Ezra' we have the 'incorrigible optimism' of Robert Browning characteristically disclosed. This poet is not 'other-worldly.' He has the flavour of earth, the exultation in human struggles and experiences. The great thing about life is that it brings us experience. These varying experiences are to be eagerly looked forward to. They are to be welcomed. Even death is not to be shrinked from. This earth is a potter's wheel on which God shapes us. As one realizes the coming on of old age, one should preserve a wholesome and invigorating view of life. Old age is the best of life for which the earlier years were made. It furnishes perspective, a chance to estimate values, and by the advantage thus gained to face the future. 'How good to live and learn.' The changes and experiences of life are not meaningless but have a purpose.

Then, welcome each rebuff
That turns earth's smoothness rough.
Each sting that bids nor sit nor stand but go!
Be our joys three-parts pain:
Strive and hold cheap the strain;
Learn, nor account the pang; dare, never grudge the throe!

An exceedingly interesting suggestion in connexion with this problem is found in Shelley's 'Prometheus Unbound.' We find in the poem that the world is made up of a number of things. Fate, pain, woe, time, furies, torture, solitude—all have conspired against Prometheus. The tragedy of his fate and of life is in these diverse elements, jarring and conflicting. The world is out of tune because of it all. But Prometheus does not accept the world as it is. Back of it all there is a perfected world in which all is order and beauty and justice. The true meaning of what takes place is not apparent on the surface of things. They all must be interpreted with relation to the end. We note in Shelley's drama how varying are the moods and sudden the transitions. Voices, furies, demons, oceanides, echoes, gods, break into the scene in a perfectly bewildering way. We have

to read much and carefully to discover any continuity about it. But all this diversity has a purpose. It all moves forward to a goal in which all the seeming conflicting elements of life have given way to a condition of harmony and peace. It is a parable of life. The life that refuses to accept the universe as it is, sets itself against the will of the universe, finds that the seemingly irreconcilable and diverse factors that we must face are but factors that—directly and indirectly—assist in the evolution onward and upward.

The essential thought of Shelley's creed as we have it in the *Prometheus* is that the universe is penetrated and vitalized by a spirit that is identified now as the spirit of Nature and now as Eternal Love. It is the power back of all things. It is the judgement to which all things must submit. It is the unity in which all differences are at last reconciled.

What would it avail to bid thee gaze
On the revolving world? What to bid speak
Fate, Time, Occasion, Chance and Change? To these
All things are subject but Eternal Love.

Shelley presents the argument in this poem that while there is evil and change in the world, it is not a part of the permanent order of things. The very spirit of the universe is against evil. Evil plays its part in the evolutionary process and so is made to serve the good. The spirit of the universe—Eternal Love—will eventually triumph and then will come a perfected and beautiful universe. There will be a sweet peal at midnight, all the people will come into the streets transfigured with a new beauty; there will be no more poison in the nightshade berries and no more tempests on the sea. In that world and time:

We will sit and talk of time and change
As the world ebbs and flows, ourselves unchanged.

Life may be complex, it may be made up of different moods and emotions, diverse experiences, but it all has its meaning. It is not to be looked upon as blind caprice or chance. What happens is linked together by a unity and this unity gives intelligence to the seeming disparity. 'The One remains, the many change and pass.' This is Shelley's answer to the problem of change.

The author of the biblical drama of *Job* raises the question if there is any deep, underlying reality that binds the differing incidents and experiences of life into a unity? Here is the patriarch *Job* caught in the meshes of earthly life. He finds life a succession of disconnected events. Anything may happen. What happens seems to have no meaning. There is no orderly continuity about life. Is this just the penalty for being caught in the meshes of existence and is there nothing to be done but to curse God and die? But *Job* maintains a stoical instead of a pessimistic attitude. The author of the book of *Job* is sure that the answer to the evil and suffering of life lies back of visible experience. If, for example, one could penetrate into the heavenly court then the answer would be evident and faith in God

would be maintained. Yet Job, denied this revelation, spite of suffering and change, maintains just this attitude nevertheless. There is a fundamental unity to life's diversity in experience and Nature and this Job identifies with God.

What we have reflected in the works of these writers is merely the attitude toward this question of change held by the men and women about us. There is no one answer that comes with a satisfactory finality. Nor is it the purpose of this article to attempt such an answer. Rather the purpose is to show that in the consideration of the ultimate problems of our universe, we shall do well to go, not only to the books of the philosophers, but to the poets and the novelists.

HARRY PRESSFIELD.

Methodist Episcopal Church, Carson City, Nevada, U.S.A.

DANTE'S PARADISE

God was made man that man might know God. Only in terms of the human could man understand God. So also God reveals the spiritual and eternal Realities in terms of the temporal and material world. The Bible is full of metaphors, and symbols, and splendid imagery. Heaven and Hell and eternal verities are presented to us in terms of the visible world. We read of a great white throne and one sitting thereon, and He that sat was like a jasper and a sardian stone. Sun, moon and stars, fire and water, sea and land, beasts of the earth and men and women, all these pass before our vision in Ezekiel and in the Revelation of St. John. Now this is also the method of Dante, or rather of the Spirit of Truth who inspired Dante to write the great poem. Flaming stars, blood red planets, streaming meteors and flashing comets, golden glitterances of effulgent radiance, ladders with their foot on earth and their top beyond the stars, wheels and circles and mathematical figures, men and women, fields ablaze with flowers, awful creatures inspiring wonder, gleamings and scintillations, lustrous eyes of a beautiful woman, called Beatrice, rhythmic movement, gorgeous robes and a mystic rose whose petals form a circumference that is infinite. These are some of the signs and symbols made use of by the Spirit inspiring this great and divine poet. If we are to appreciate Dante we must have an inspiration that sees in all phenomena the reflection of some eternal reality.

Dante represents Hell as consisting of ever-narrowing circles, the ninth being at the centre of the earth. He represents Purgatory as a mountainous island rising out of the sea; Heaven as above our heads, beginning with the moon and ending, if indeed one can speak of an ending of that which is infinite, that is with the Empyrean. The moon is conceived of as the first heaven, Mercury the second, Venus third, Sun fourth, Mars fifth, Jupiter sixth, Saturn seventh, Fixed Stars eighth, then the ninth, whence they ascend into what is

called the Empyrean. Here we see how imagination enables the soul to soar to God on wings of the actual and material. Sun, moon and stars are outward and visible signs of realities in the spiritual world. They are the abodes of the Holy Souls that enjoy the Vision of God. They are stepping stones to higher and nobler things. Sun, moon and stars are but shadows cast by some eternal reality. The lilies of the valley fade, they die and we cast them from us as dead flowers. No! we do not cast from us what we saw and loved, that remains in the heart for ever. So Dante sees through the appearances into the substances and realities of things.

No very great change has passed over these spirits of the blest whom Dante sees in Heaven. Chief of all, of course, is Beatrice. She is still his lady, the same whom he met that great day by the bridge over the Arno in Florence. She is now in eternity what she was then in time. There is something intensely human about these radiant spirits that circle and process and intermingle like motes in the sunbeam. We feel that they are men and women, and men such as we ourselves have known. And what would Heaven be without recognition? I have heard this question seriously discussed as to whether we should know each other there. The very question is absurd. It would be contrary to the very nature of things if the mother did not know, and clasp to her bosom, her own child. Will the man who has truly loved a woman, as Dante loved Beatrice, know her in Heaven? In the very nature of things of course he will know her, and will know none else as lover in eternity.

Then there is what I may term the intensely human element in the joy of Heaven. Indeed Dante seems to find his greatest joy in Beatrice. He says:

I thought that mine had dived into the bottom of my grace
And of my bliss in Paradise.

It is Beatrice, herself, who represents Divine wisdom, who teaches Dante that there are deeper depths of bliss to be dived into. 'As I gazed on her affection found no room for other wish. While the everlasting pleasure that did full on Beatrice shine, with second view From her fair countenance my gladdened soul contented vanquishing me with a beam of her soft smile she spake, "Turn thee and list, these eyes are not thy only Paradise."'

The joy of Heaven will be manifold like the joy of lovers on an ideal summer's day among the woodlands. Not only do they enjoy each other, but also the warm sunshine, the shimmering haze, the soft breezes, the various colours of the flowers, the fleecy white clouds and the gorgeous setting of the sun, the beauty of these things severally and collectively enters into their souls. So in Heaven the joy is manifold. But the pure, holy joy in the companionship of holy and beautiful souls will come first.

Then there will be the fulfilment of desire. By this we do not mean that desire will cease, for desire must be eternal, if joy is to be eternal. Desire is of the very essence and substance of life. But there will be

eternal fulfilment of eternal desire. 'There on each desire completion waits and there on mine: where every aim is found.'

Dante sees in Heaven the Lovers of Justice in all ages and nations. He sees an eagle. He hears the eagle speak as with one voice proceeding from a multitude of spirits that compose it.

Before my sight appeared with open wing
The beauteous image, in fruition sweet,
Gladdening the thronged spirits. Each did seem
A little ruby whereon so intense
The sunbeam glow'd that to mine eyes it came
In clear refraction. And that, which next
Befals me to pourtray, voice hath not utter'd
Nor ink hath written, nor in fantasy
Ne'er conceived. For I beheld a man
The beak discoursed and what intention formed
Of many, singly as if one express,
Beginning For that I was just and piteous,
I am exalted to this height of glory.

Every action and policy and plan must be strictly the criterion of eternal Justice. Nor is mere essential Justice enough. It must be tempered with mercy or as it is here 'pity'—'Because I was just and piteous.' We must be piteous even as the Great Father is piteous. Justice, sheer justice, would demand our punishment but by the pity of God we are spared.

Then Dante saw the warriors who had fought a good fight in the cause of progress and against evil, in the Heaven of the planet Mars, ranged in the sign of the cross athwart which the spirits move to the sound of a hymn.

Now to him
From end to end
And 'tween the summit and the base
Did move Lights scintillating,
As they met and passed
And these lights were the spirits
Of the dead warriors.

He compares their movement to and fro in the 'glitterance of Christ's Cross' to the movement of notes in the sunbeam. Then he heard melodious music: 'And as the chime of minstrel music, dulcimer and harp with many strings, a pleasant dinning make. To him who heareth not distinct the note. So from the lights, which there appeared to us. Gather'd along the cross and melody.' 'That indistinctly heard, with ravishment, Possessed me Yet I mark'd it was a hymn of lofty praise for then came to me "Arise and Conquer" as to one who hears and comprehends not. Me such ecstasy o'ercame that never till that hour that held me in so sweet imprisonment.'

This is the great gospel of Action preached by Dante in this poem, glittering with brilliance and imagery, like the magic cross of precious stones in Aylwin. 700 years ago Dante preached the gospel of work, of activity, of conflict. But the greatest joy of all is in the Vision of Jesus Christ triumphing with the Church and the vision of God. Beatrice cried:

Behold the triumphal hosts
Of Christ and all the harvest
Gather'd in.

And as she spake these words Dante saw in her eyes fulness of joy.

Dante in the twelfth century and Thomas Carlyle in the nineteenth both preached the same gospel. Dante saw the spirit of those who had refused to grovel and cringe beneath the frown of tyrants who had arisen conscious of some Divine Destiny and had struck a blow, it may be many blows, for freedom and purity and honour. Thomas Carlyle says: 'If you would have your place in the glitterance of Christ, if you would float in the eternal ruby light of the Cross of Sacrifice you must resist, you must struggle, you must breast the waves, fight your way thro' hostile gangs of banditti, climb with bleeding feet and bleeding hands, for Heaven is promised to him that overcometh.'

ERNEST J. B. KIRTLAN, B.A., B.D., D.D.

'THE HISTORICAL REALITY OF JESUS'

IN the July issue of this Review (p. 386) I am alluded to as 'the late Dr. Edward Greenly.' Well; although I am over seventy, the expression is, so far, premature. It occurs in an article by Mr. Hogarth on 'A Revised Version of the Myth-Theory of Jesus'; and I do not regret the episode, because it gives me an opportunity, which I have long desired, to make known that, since writing the booklet *The Historical Reality of Jesus* I have seen reason to make a total change of view. In fact, in December, 1932, I wrote to its publishers, expressing a very strong wish that it should not be re-printed. Nevertheless; is the summary stigmatization 'made up of suppositions and fanciful analogies' quite fair to that abandoned booklet? It recites something like thirty points from history and literature, and gives brief discussions of them. Finally; the constructive theory suggested on pp. 19-22 is expressly entitled 'A Working Hypothesis,' with a caution to the reader that it is no more than that.

But now let me be quite frank. It has come to seem to me that the thesis of 'non-historicity' is not established by any of the pieces of evidence cited; since in every single case I now perceive as possible a different interpretation. What is of much more importance; I do not think they prove that thesis even when taken all together: a different interpretation still remains open to us. 'Historicity' has been arraigned by all available evidence, and it has stood the test. What the evidence does show is that there are a number of more or less obscure points which call for further investigation, and would probably repay it. But that will not be done by me. For my change of view has brought home to me that I am a geologist, not a Biblical scholar; and it was not prudent to intermeddle in a highly controversial matter quite outside my own subject. *Ne sutor supra crepidam.*

I have also a different reason for withdrawing that booklet from circulation. At no stage of my career have I held the dismal dogma that death is the end of all. But in the last few years I have been carried much further than that. I have been taught by an experience

which searches the very depths of the heart: by the loss of a noble wife, the overwhelming importance to Man of a faith in Immortality. Now that faith, for most of us, is based on Christianity. So I would not now publish a word which was likely to undermine confidence in Christianity.

EDWARD GREENLY (Hon.) D.Sc., F.G.S., &c.

London for Shakespeare Lovers. By William Kent. (Methuen & Co. 3s. 6d.)

This little book makes a double appeal both to lovers of Shakespeare and lovers of London. It has grown out of a lecture delivered in Stratford-on-Avon, and describes Shakespeare's London, his Life there; The Shakespearian Theatres; London in Shakespeare's Plays, and Memorials of Shakespearian Interest. These chapters are packed with facts which throw new light on the dramatist and his times. They are followed by 'Two Shakespearian Rambles': from Blackfriars Bridge to St. Magnus, the Martyr, London Bridge, and along Bankside. Four pages of 'Useful Information,' and an Index complete the book. Every statement is supported by reference to authorities and the reader's interest is kept alive from the first page to the last. It is an expert piece of work with an astonishing mass of well-arranged matter and claims a place on the shelves of every lover of Shakespeare and of London. It is a delightful guide to the scenes of the dramatist's life and work, full of out-of-the-way information.

Christ Triumphant. (Allen & Unwin, 5s.).—This Anthology of great Christian Experiences has been compiled by N. G., who listened to the soul-revealing stories of the House Party of the Oxford Group by the side of Lake Constance. Life to them meant fellowship with God. This volume has been prepared to inspire hope in our spiritual quest. The experiences are gathered into seven sections: The Kingdom of God is within you; Surrender; Guidance of God; In Silence; Realization; Faith; Prayer. There are brief notes on the authors, among whom we find George Eliot, Francis of Assisi, John Wesley, Tolstoy, George Fox, Alexander Whyte and *The Times*. It is a selection that will bring real pleasure and rich profit to all who use it.

Ancient Wives and Modern Husbands. By Clarence E. Macartney. (Cokesbury Press. \$25.)

Nine Old Testament wives pass across the stage to the author's comments and comparisons. Husbands are about as important here as the average bridegroom at a modern wedding. Those who are good at character preaching may find some unworked lines in this book. The wives are not those who usually figure as 'women of the Bible.' The treatment is often novel. Speakers at women's meetings may find some stimulus in these delineations.

Recent Literature

THEOLOGY AND APOLOGETICS

Jesus Christ and Primitive Need. By Charles Pelham Groves, B.A., B.D. (Epworth Press. 6s.)

The new Fernley Hartley Lecture is 'A Missionary Study in the Christian Message,' by an Ex-Primitive Methodist Minister, who served for thirteen years in South-Eastern Nigeria in close contact with an African people, and is now tutor at Kingsmead, Selly Oak Colleges, Birmingham. He unfolds his subject under three aspects. The Christian Message in History and Experience; the Characterization of Simple Folk, and Good News for Simple Folk. The Message is based on history, on the life, death and resurrection of Jesus Christ. The Synoptic Gospels reflect substantially the body of teaching about Jesus Christ that the missionary work of the Church had made necessary. The centre of Christ's vision is God, of whom Jesus asserts that He is never less than the parent in the human parent-child relationship at its best. 'The human parent is limited in knowledge and understanding, in patience and self-giving. Such limitations are not to be transferred to our Father in heaven. He cares for all His creatures and His love is not quenched by the rejection' of it.

The coming of Jesus is then considered in its relation to Judaism, to events in the Graeco-Roman world and in its subsequent development in the Christian Church. Christ is 'the one Figure that has remained undimmed by the ravages of time; the one Figure indeed, that has gained new lustre as the adequacy of His Message and of Himself to human need in any age and against any background of inherited belief, has been declared in human life.' The second part of the Lecture brings out, with many tragic illustrations, the life struggle of primitive folk to whom it is an adventure beset with peril from witchcraft. The influence is entirely malignant and there is no cure. Black magic is another terror and the native lives in a constant atmosphere of suspicion and distrust. There is also a fatalism which fetters the will and destroys all energy. To this must be added the tyranny of custom and belief in a mystic environment. Primitive man finds himself in a mysterious universe. The Supreme Being is a Creator but remote from the world of men. You may appeal to him in desperate straits, but he is too high to be troubled with the affairs of every day that press upon the soul. He dwells afar. The Christian Message is Good News for Simple Folk. It reveals God as accessible and near at hand. He has come among men that they may both know Him and love Him. The message also binds men together in a fellowship based on love so that a new Society

emerges. Human nature is raised to Christ's stature of manhood. Personality is liberated, disciplined and re-created. That is the task to which the missionary is consecrated and success depends on his embodying the life of which he is the messenger and adapting his message to those whom he wishes to lead into a new world of grace and peace. There is rich material here for missionary workers and advocates, and it is presented in a way that will wake a response in the hearts of all true Christians.

The Christian Message for the World To-day. (Allen & Unwin. 5s.)

This is 'a joint statement of the world-wide mission of the Christian Church.' It describes the mood of our generation; the growing faith of Communism; the new religion of Nationalism, and the world economic crisis. The Second Part unfolds the Christian Message, shows its world-wide reach and the purpose and motive of missions. The Christian faith has to bring its message to the child of the modern age, baffled and nerveless before the currents of the time. Communism claims to be changing the world, but it is essentially reactionary and conservative. Christians are in possession of something far more revolutionary and are called to accept an intellectual and moral as well as spiritual discipline adequate to building on earth the walls of the City of God. Paul of Tarsus was the first who really understood Christianity. The youth of to-day wants a supreme fashion, it wants a faith, and 'never has such an opportunity presented itself to the Christian forces of the world. With all its faults the modern missionary movement has been an outpouring of the life of the churches of Europe and America which is helping to make the pressure of the West on non-Western peoples a blessing and not an unmitigated curse.' Dr. Stanley Jones writes the closing chapter on 'The Motives of Missions'—production of Christ-like character in individuals and in Society and shows how this may be brought about. The book has a cogent message for the Church as well as the world.

The Victorian Transformation of Theology. By J. Scott Lidgett, C.H., M.A., D.D. (Epworth Press. 2s. 6d.)

The Dean of Westminster, who presided at the first of these Maurice lectures, says in his Foreword, that at any moment in the last fifty or sixty years it would have done us all good to be reminded of F. D. Maurice and his teaching, but it is specially opportune to-day. 'He was a great Theologian and he was also the greatest exponent in modern times of practical Christianity. He taught men the necessary effect on life of a right belief in God.' The institution of the lectureship in memory of Maurice is specially noteworthy when the history of his connexion with King's College, which terminated in 1851, is borne in mind. Dean Inge gave the first Lectures; Dr. Lidgett felt it one of the greatest honours of his life to be asked to deliver the second. Half a century ago he made a close study of the more

important of Maurice's writings. They confirmed the view, which he had already formed, that Christian theology must be restated in terms of the Fatherhood of God. He regards Maurice as by far the most important and significant personality in the religious thought and life of England in the past century. 'He owes his pre-eminent importance and influence to his marvellous combination of prophetic witness, systematic thought, and creative endeavour, united and inspired by the ceaseless aspiration and pursuit of a wholly consecrated and truly saintly life.' Dr. Lidgett makes a brief survey of the situation as it confronted Maurice at his ordination, just a century ago, on the threshold of the Victorian era. The medley of existing opinions and aims left Religion, Thought and Life utterly unprepared to meet either the increase of knowledge—historical, scientific and comparative—or the advent of democracy. Maurice's substitution of the Fatherhood of God for His sovereignty became the organizing and unifying Truth of Christian thought and life for the Christian religion of our age. His doctrine of Eternal Life and his view of human nature as set forth in the Gospel of the Incarnation are dwelt upon and four chapters are devoted to the Fatherhood of God, the Incarnation and the Atonement. Maurice's restoration of the Fatherhood of God to its primacy in Christian thought and life was the greatest Theological and religious achievement of the nineteenth century in this country. He interpreted the Fatherhood in the light of the Incarnation and the Atonement. The Incarnation was 'the fulfilment of human hopes, the satisfaction of spiritual needs, and the justification of assumptions which underlie the entire course of human development.' The Passion was the achievement which Christ set His face to accomplish. Dr. Lidgett finds the central truth regarding the Atonement in the second chapter of the Epistle to the Hebrews and sums up the teaching of his Lectures in a very clear and effective set of propositions. His book is small but it is a masterpiece which embodies the mature thought of a lifetime, and one that lays Christian thinkers under renewed obligation to the lecturer.

The Social Triumph of the Ancient Church. By Shirley Jackson Chase. (Allen & Unwin. 6s.)

These five suggestive and striking lectures were delivered in the University of Chicago on the Rauschenbusch Foundation. The world into which Christianity entered regarded human welfare as the business of Deity. 'Mankind had not been charged with the task of effecting its own social salvation.' The new faith accelerated charitable and humanitarian attitudes, but Christian emperors were no more active than their heathen predecessors in promulgating social reforms. The earlier representatives of the new religion were notably lacking in worldly possessions but three centuries of struggle brought Christianity to a position of prominence in the economic life of the Roman world, so that it could boldly emerge upon the main highway to social respectability. Almost two centuries passed before its leaders realized that it was called to rehabilitate the existing

order by living the Christian life in all the varied relationships of society. It was relatively late in acquiring artistic and architectural significance for ancient society and thus acquiring social respectability among the aristocratic and cultured people of the Roman Empire. The struggle for toleration was won when Christianity attained the status of a legal religion throughout the empire. 'There was no longer any area of political or religious activity over which the Church did not exercise guardianship. Its social triumph was now complete.' It had set itself the great task of rescuing the Roman Empire from all its troubles. It had been intrusted with the full guardianship of ancient society. The position taken by Roman Catholicism and by Protestantism in this situation is considered. The Church to-day with its economic problems and its task of eliminating war, has a range of issues far wider than those which the early Christians had to face. Mr. Chase opens out these problems and concludes that 'the most effective way to Christianize the Social Order is to socialize the Christian religion.'

The Case for Faith-Healing. By J. D. Beresford. (Allen & Unwin. 5s.)

The Rev. H. R. L. Sheppard, in his Preface, thinks that the chapter on the Nature of Faith in this volume will be a real help to its readers and that no book has for many years so ably expounded the subject of faith-healing. Mr. Beresford holds that a thought in the mind, may by its translation into emotion, exercises a measurable effect on bodily function. He rejects the idea of the 'Subconscious Self as the unknown guest of Maeterlinck's portrait, for we are dealing with a unity, however diverse its manifestations on the physical plane.' The 'attributes and effects of faith are also those that we ascribe to the spirit of love'—submission to the intellect and disregard of personal, selfish desires. The writer concludes that many objects of belief will serve a useful purpose so long as the patient can believe in them enough. We take an immense stride forward when the object of belief has a religious significance. The patient must abandon the control of the conscious will. The book is certainly sane and well thought out.

Spiritual Healing. By Malcolm Spencer and H. W. Workman. (S.C.M. 2s. 6d.)

One of the soundest presentations of a vexed question we have read. The writers are convinced that spiritual healing is a possibility. Many doctors now accept the psycho-somatic unity of the patient and work from that conception. This book insists upon the need for the communication of a fresh living experience of God. Spiritual healing is possible only in the case of a spiritually-minded person. It is no easy remedy applied without discrimination. A mind aware of the present nearness and beneficence of God may straighten out psychical tangles and redress bodily disorders. The unexplored wealth of the Community of Saints is stressed. The reinforcement that can be

given by the prayers of the saints may powerfully co-operate with the personality of the believing individual. The book is too sane to be sensational. It is of constructive value.

The Son of God. By Karl Adam. Translated by Philip Hereford. (Sheed & Ward. 7s. 6d.)

This is a most up-to-date essay in Christology. This Roman Catholic author is winning for himself great respect and admiration far outside his own communion. His erudition and sincerity are beyond question and his attempt to show us the right way to behave to Jesus Christ has many points of real value for Protestant readers. In a generation which is experimenting to its peril with the Credal foundations of our Faith there could be no more wholesome corrective than Karl Adam's book. The chapter headings give a clear indication of the scope and value of this work: Christ and the Man of To-day; The Way of Faith; The Sources for the Life of Jesus; The Mental Stature of Jesus; The Interior Life of Jesus; The Self-revelation of Jesus; The Resurrection of Christ; The Atonement. There is a twofold object in this study: Christ Himself and the specific work He came to do. His examination of the Resurrection as the confirmation by God of the claims made by our Lord—and also as a fact against the Vision theory, is especially fine.

Christian Worship in the Primitive Church. By Alexander B. Macdonald, M.A., B.D., Ph.D. (T. & T. Clark. 7s. 6d.)

Originally an exercise for the degree of Ph.D., this work was wisely prepared for publication. It holds a place apart from other books on Christian Worship, alike as history and interpretation. It presents a united account of the Worship of the Primitive Church as related to the spiritual experience of the worshippers. The author keeps in mind what the worshipper was thinking and feeling and experiencing to lead him to express himself during worship in certain modes and forms. Special regard is given to the Primitive period, yet various lines of development are indicated. The book in its general features contains a study of Primitive Christian Worship, first showing the social aspects of Christian Fellowship, then the religious aspect. Next the element of joyous confidence in the worshippers is analysed. Then the Worship is described as Spirit-controlled. An historical sketch of forms and customs of worship is also given. In greater detail there is a discussion of Word-of-God Service and of the Sacraments. The author discriminates between the 'Breaking of Bread' and the 'Pauline Lord's Supper.' The former was a simple successor of the fellowship-meals the disciples shared with Christ during His life-time. Their thoughts were not dominated by the 'broken-body.' The Presence of Christ—not His Death—was the key-note. Finally, we see how Worship held a central place in early Christian life and thought. While no attempt is made to draw morals for our conduct of worship to-day, yet the result is that the reader is prompted to consider the advantage of introducing into worship more of the element

of objectivity. In the Primitive Church 'the worshipper's mind became habitated to an objective poise—to an adoring, contemplative gaze, directed, not inwards, but outwards. . . . It was believed to accomplish something actual, something objective, as between man and God.

W. R. CHAPMAN.

The Fall of Man. Its Place in Modern Thought. By H. F. Powell, D.D. (S.P.C.K. 5s.)

The Dean of Exeter, in his Foreword, pays tribute to the way in which Dr. Powell has tackled this difficult subject and to his sense of the deep spiritual issues which it involves. He holds that the doctrine of the Fall, considered as a rebellion of humanity or a general misdirection of man's evolution, resulting in an unbalanced nature, cannot be held if due weight is given to the arguments furnished by philosophy, the theory of evolution, and psychology. Dr. Powell regards the doctrine of a Fall as most congenial to a purely transcendent view of God. Judaism did not grasp the idea of immanence. 'Science has no room for a Fall, and Science is what God teaches.' He feels that the expression 'born in sin' is offensive. 'The appeal to the best in man "works." There is no belittling of sin; it appears graver in the new teaching. The way of renewal is in the direction of a worthier conception of God. The doctrine of the Fall, based on premises no longer to be admitted, cannot be retained.' 'If we are led by our larger knowledge to the belief that life, in spite of temporary setbacks and local retrogressions, has, on the whole, been one long process of gradual advance towards the fulfilment of the Divine purpose, we shall without regret part with a doctrine that postulates a primal disastrous declension.' The idea that to abandon the doctrine of original sin would compromise the need for redemption is, he thinks, mistaken. The need really springs from the felt inadequacy and unsatisfactoriness of our personal lives. Dean Matthews suggests that at one or two points he should part company with Dr. Powell, but the subject well deserves the careful consideration which he asks for it.

The Call of Israel. An Introduction to the Study of Divine Election. By W. J. Phythian-Adams. (H. Milford. 8s. 6d.)

The Canon of Carlisle writes for students who have struggled with the complexities of critical analysis till they have ceased to regard the Heptateuch as providing any reliable information about the early history of Israel. He examines the faith of the Psalmists, the Prophets, and the Fathers, and holds that the extraordinary contrast between the Israel of Egypt and of Canaan cannot be explained by a single miracle however highly we rate the strength of the personality of Moses. The Tradition which inspired the faith of Israel is a living memory, 'not that shadow of it which survives in the Books of Exodus and Numbers.' The structure, basis, and guardians of that

Tradition are examined in three chapters and in the third part 'the Miracle of the Call' is discussed. This is the part of the Study which many will deem revolutionary. The fall of the walls of Jericho and the drying-up of the Jordan are ascribed to seismic activity, the pillar of cloud and fire to volcanic emission of vapour, and the miracles of the plagues and the Red Sea to stupendous convulsions of Nature which 'burst into sudden and violent activity, to play their part, often remote and invisible, in one of the greatest of all human stories.' The theory is illustrated by reference to eruptions of Mont Pelée and Vesuvius and the writer holds that we may thus gain a conception of the reality of these great events of the Call of Israel which will give us 'a wider prospect of faith, a clearer view of the methods of that Eternal Craftsman, who worketh all things after the counsel of His Will.' That is the burden of an interpretation which will startle many and convince few.

Love is Lord, by R. Moffat Gautrey (Epworth Press. 1s. 6d.), is 'an Exposition of St. Paul's Matchless Poem 1 Cor. xiii,' which is based on Dr. Moffatt's translation and is divided into ten chapters which begin with St. Paul as 'Poet and Preacher too' and end with 'Love the Victor.' Each section would furnish rich material for use in the class meeting or for private devotion. The exposition is fresh and stimulating, happily set forth and well illustrated. Thoughtful readers will take it to their hearts as they took Mr. Gautrey's *This Tremendous Lover* and *The Burning Cataracts of Christ*.

Studies in St. Mark, vi. 1-13, 30-56., by J. Alexander Findlay, M.A. (Epworth Press. 4d.). This Manual of Fellowship regards the shadow of misunderstanding which began to creep in between Jesus and His disciples as due to the fact that they had come to regard Him as the heaven-sent leader to the Utopia of their dreams. Other difficult questions are here faced and handled. Each section is divided into paragraphs and followed by a suggestive questionnaire.

The Gospels: A Short Introduction, by Vincent Taylor, M.A. (Epworth Press. 2s. 6d.), has reached a second edition and approved itself as the best cheap volume on the great subject. It ought to be in the hands of every student of the four Gospels, for it will give them new meaning and new beauty.

The Book of the Throne, by George W. West (Marshall, Morgan & Scott. 3s. 6d.), regards the *Revelation* as a prophecy and discusses the construction and the interpretation of its seals and visions. Mr. West has no doubt that it was written by the Apostle John toward the close of the first century. He lays stress on the evangelical message of the book, and its connexion with the prophecies of *Daniel*.

The Midnight Alarm and other addresses by Evangelist Harold Watson (Stockwell, 1s.), are earnest Gospel messages and such references as that to Tel Aviv, the Jewish city, show that the speaker's eyes are open to the events of our time.

HISTORY, BIOGRAPHY, TRAVEL

The Expansion of the Christian Church. By P. Gardner-Smith and F. J. Foakes-Jackson. (Cambridge University Press. 7s. 6d.)

The series to which this volume belongs has been prepared to provide teachers of boys and girls with little books which may severally provide a term's work for their pupils, and taken together may present a general view of the Christian religion and the Christian Church which would explain the position to-day. Mr. Gardner-Smith, with whom the idea of the series originated, describes the Church in the Roman Empire; Dr. Foakes-Jackson follows with the history of the Church in the Middle Ages and in England. The section on the Middle Ages also appears in a separate half-crown volume.

Mr. Gardner-Smith gives an impressive sketch of the Roman Empire, of life in the Early Church, the growth of the Creed, Monasticism and the Church in action. The accounts of Ambrose and Chrysostom are admirable and lead up to a final view of the 'Church Supreme' at the end of the fifth century when Christianity was almost universally professed throughout the Roman world. Dr. Foakes-Jackson brings the story down to the Renaissance and the Reformation, with well-measured estimates of the character and work of Luther and Calvin. The third part traces the 'Church in England' from before the Reformation, through the breach with Roman authority, down to its 'new life in the nineteenth century.' The division of the work into paragraphs is a real aid to the student and the survey is marked by ample knowledge put into compact and suggestive form. The history will be of great service not only to teachers and scholars but to all who wish for a bird's-eye view of a subject of never-failing interest, and of vital importance.

John Galsworthy: Le Romancier, par Eduard Guyot, Professeur à la Sorbonne (Paris: Henry Didier), confines itself to the romances and is to be followed by a second volume, *John Galsworthy le Conteur, le Dramaturge, l'Artiste*, which will contain a bibliography of the romances. The study belongs to the *Les Grandes Écrivains Étrangers* which includes Jane Austen, and literary celebrities of various countries. Prof. Guyot gives a facsimile of a letter which Galsworthy wrote him in 1925 and a noble portrait dated 31 Janvier, 1933. M. Guyot finds the first characteristic of Galsworthy is to be English, to synthesize and condense all the traits which distinguish the English from other nations. He places himself at the heart of the citadel from which he views its feeble points. Detailed studies are given of *Les Pharisiens de L'Ile*; *Dignostic du Forsytisme*; Soames—*L'Appel de la Beauté* which Pascall analysed with exact care. *Fraternity* turns our attention to the romance of intrigue. It is preoccupied with moral issues and finds its interest in the development of certain contrasts. Shadows are as necessary to the romance as light. M. Guyot concludes his interesting

study with the judgement that Galsworthy reveals the prejudices and intimate feeblenesses of his country without ever doubting of its future.

Dante Gabriel Rossetti, par L. Wolff, Professeur a la Faculté des Lettres de Rennes, belongs to the same series and has a striking portrait reproduced by permission of Ellis & Co., New Bond Street. A full account is given of Rossetti's ancestry and his father's share in the political life of the time which led to his flight from Italy. His marriage and the birth of his children are chronicled and then we trace Gabriel through his infancy and youth, to his courtship of Elizabeth Siddal, their marriage and her tragic fate. We have never seen that story of his Beatrice told with such pathetic detail. The beauty of the young girl made a deep impression on all who knew her. Rossetti's work after her death and the chapter on the man and the artist form a discriminating estimate of his character and his poetry. His wonderful generosity and the strong attachment felt for him by his friends stand out. His boundless admiration for the work of Burne-Jones did much to overcome the timidity of his friend. His eagerness for gain sometimes passed the bounds of delicacy. The biography is one of real value and the extended bibliography shows what research Professor Wolff has given to the whole subject. He has certainly laid all students of Rossetti under a great debt.

The Origins of International Rivalry in Samoa. 1845-1884.

By Sylvia Masterman, M.A. (Allen & Unwin. 10s. 6d.)

Samoa came into the European limelight through Robert Louis Stevenson and his *Vailima Letters* and by the bravery of the men of H.M.S. *Calliope* in the Apia hurricane. Miss Masterman's study has special interest because she is a native of New Zealand and that island Dominion has been entrusted with the good government of Samoa under mandate from the Powers. In 1884 the German Consul forced an agreement on the native rulers against which the British and American Consuls protested vigorously. A full account is given of the conflicting interests and of the influence exerted by the London Missionary Society in anglicizing the islands. The origin of British, and German interests, is traced with the awakening of New Zealand's interests and the growth of American trade. Years of unrest led to the treaties of 1876-9 which really rendered peace impossible. Native autonomy proved a failure and in 1884 affairs were in a tangle due partly to the weakness of native political organization and partly to foreign aggression. Nowhere in the Pacific was native organization looser or more incapable of maintaining order, and nowhere was the hold of foreign powers more tenacious, or foreign rights more evenly balanced. The whole subject is handled with great ability and clear conception of the issues involved by the transition in half a century from a state of primitive but happy disorder to semi-civilized but most unhappy confusion.

The New Methodist Hymn Book Illustrated in History and Experience, by John Telford (Epworth Press. 6s.), gives an account of every hymn and the miracles of grace which have attended them. It is

a book that will give new joy and interest to our service of song. *Subject, Textual and Lineal Indexes to the Methodist Hymn Book* (5s.) is a wonderful piece of expert work which the Rev. J. Henry Martin and Mr. Walter Dell have prepared with extraordinary care. Its value is beyond words. The Rev. J. C. Mantripp in *The Devotional Use of the Hymn Book* (3s 6d.), has given us a real aid to the quiet hour. Hymns have a rare power to lift the soul to higher things and this little volume will be sure of a welcome. So also will the Rev. A. S. Gregory's *Hymns and the Faith*, which is one of the 'Manuals of Fellowship' (4d.), and no one should fail to get it and use it.

A Saunter through Kent with Pen and Pencil, by Charles Igglesden. (Ashford: the Kentish Express. 3s. 6d.) Volume xxviii in the series of "Saunters through Kent," is devoted entirely to the Isle of Sheppey, the jewel island of Kent which played an important part in the Viking invasions. On November 14, 1002, Ethelbert gave orders for a general massacre of the Danes whom Alfred had allowed to settle in Sheppey, and in revenge King Swayne ravaged our Eastern coasts and put to death thousands of Saxons. Sir Charles Igglesden begins his survey with Sheerness in whose harbour Nelson's whole fleet could anchor. The memorials in the garrison church are pages in our naval history. The house where Nelson lived in Queenborough is an ancient red brick building close to the churchyard. The wool trade made the town very prosperous in Queen Elizabeth's time. Minster had a famous abbey but the embattled gatehouse is its sole remaining relic. The descriptions of Eastchurch, Shurland Abbey, Warden Point and Harty Ferry are full of interesting details and the volume is rich in illustrations.

Studies in Church Life in England under Edward III. By K. L. Wood-Legh, M.A., B.Litt., Ph.D. (Cambridge University Press. 10s. 6d.)

This volume belongs to the 'Cambridge Studies of Medieval Life and Thought' edited by Dr. Coulton, who supervised the thesis on which Miss Wood-Legh has based her book. Her work has grown out of much research into the Patent Rolls which have yielded new treasures to successive generations of historians and antiquaries ever since Prynne began to disinter them from the cobwebs and filth in which they were then lying. The writer's first task was to read the entire series of volumes of Patent Rolls for the reign of Edward III, endeavouring to note all the items that concerned the Church. She found matter to which others had referred only rarely and by chance. She fixed on five topics and has made each the subject of a separate essay, making constant use of material drawn from other sources, such as the Calendars of Close and Fine Rolls, of Papal Letters and Petitions, Miscellaneous Inquisitions and the printed Episcopal Registers and Borough Records. The subjects chosen are Royal Administration of Religious Houses; Royal Visitations of Hospitals and Free Chapels; Alienations in Mortmain; Chantries; Appropriation of Parish Churches. A flood of light is thrown on the religious life of the reign.

The debts on the religious houses were largely due to excessive expenditure and three monks of St. Mary's, York, are instructed to apply the income to discharge the debts of the abbey and 'desist the showing of hospitality and other less necessary expenses until the house is out of debt.' The monasteries suffered from the hostility of the townsmen and from tenants who refused to pay their accustomed services. The monasteries gained by the royal protection but were indirectly preparing the way for that exercise of royal authority by which they were eventually dissolved. The essay on 'Chantries' breaks comparatively new ground. Our knowledge of them is more indefinite than of any other institution of the mediaeval Church. Provision is made to guard 'lest by long voidance of the chantry the souls of the deceased be defrauded of their due suffrages.' A concluding chapter deals with the position of the Church in public opinion and shows that after the Black Death there was a great reduction in the number of licences for the appropriation of parish churches. Another subject is the relation of Church and State. The degree of control which the State was able to exercise over the affairs of the Church was an important factor in the life of the times, and if it was maintained throughout the Middle Ages, as there is reason to believe, it must have made the changes which followed the breach with Rome less startling to the ordinary man than they otherwise would have been. The essays are fine specimens of true historical research and are of extraordinary interest.

The Churches and Democracy. By Alexander Dunlop Lindsay, LL.D., C.B.E. (Epworth Press. 2s. 6d. & 1s. 6d.)

The eighth Beckly Social Service Lecture was delivered at Northampton by the Master of Balliol College, Oxford. He traces the origin of nineteenth-century democracy and shows that we are confronted in this crisis with something far more fundamental than a choice between this or that form of political government. It is really a conflict between two profoundly different conceptions of life. Nineteenth-century democracy for long believed that it could, unconcerned, allow economic forces to go their own way, neither affected by nor affecting the processes of social, or political life. No one nowadays really believes that. At the present time democracy and the existence of a free and independent yet socially-minded Christianity are alike threatened by a new conception of the purpose and function of the State. Some have felt the need for compulsion to secure common action had become suddenly more urgent because the social conditions necessary to democracy had somehow failed. Others felt that only State compulsory action could produce that uniformity which certain ends in social life require for their accomplishment. If the Churches cannot inspire the nation with faith, and counteract the disintegrating effect of our social divisions, who can? The Christian idea of democracy provides for both the equality of man and the reality of values and standards. The Lecture is a warning against the conception of Christianity which is so exclusively occupied with the eternal as to forget the empirical and also against being so occupied with the day-to-day

work of social service as to forget its inspiration. Experience of voluntary service in connexion with unemployment has shown that the Churches can do what the State cannot do, and can do that best in a free co-operation with the State where each organization does its own distinctive work. The fruitfulness of a free Church in a free State is showing itself in all kinds of new ways and opportunities, and whether we shall continue to have such freedom depends upon whether the Churches rise to the height of their opportunities. The Lecture is one of vital importance in an age when the success of scientific machine production demands high skill, inventiveness, and powers of organization from a few, and comparatively unskilled, undifferentiated labour from the majority. Its structure is that of an army, not of a democracy. 'If these economic mass forces win the day, and democracy, as we have known it disappears, the Churches will disappear along with it.'

The Ideals of East and West. By Kenneth Saunders, Litt.D. (Cambridge University Press. 10s. 6d.)

Dr. Saunders' work was undertaken at the suggestion of the Maharaja Gaekwar of Baroda and gives some account of the content of each developing system as well as a brief anthology. The West derives its ethics from Greek and Hebrew; Asia derives hers from Indian and Chinese teachers. The book deals with these four gifted people and with the derivative systems, Christian and Japanese. The Preface is followed by a Prologue—An Evening at Ephesus in the first century A.D. where four representatives of various religions hold a discussion on the subject. The Ethics of India, China, Japan, the Greeks, and the Hebrews are discussed in five chapters with a final chapter on Christian ethics. The description which is given of each is followed by well chosen extracts from the chief sources. The universality of Christianity is found in the great parables and in the Sermon on the Mount. Kagawa, the Japanese St. Francis, like Gandhi, a mystic and a reformer, says 'Here is the foundation for the new society.' Civilized humanity is united in acceptance of the Lord's Prayer as the model for intelligent communion with God, so profound and comprehensive are its simple clauses, so universal its aspirations. 'The ethic of the Sermon on the Mount is at once individual and social; it is the ethic for the child of God, but also for the citizen of the Kingdom of God.' The extracts given include the Beatitudes, some of the parables, the Spirit of the Apostles, and the Johannine Meditations. The Epilogue is a meeting at Chang-an (ninth century, A.D.) where four men from distant lands discuss their various faiths. It is a very effective sequel to a book of unique interest and one that shows how all that is best in the world's religions is perfected in Christianity.

The Living Religions of the Indian People. By Nicol Macnicol. (S.C.M. 10s. 6d.)

These Wilde Lectures in Natural and Comparative Religion were given in Oxford University 1932-1934. As we should expect from such

an authority, the treatment is scholarly, sympathetic and comprehensive. The aim of the lecturer is the discovery of the vital forces behind the six faiths that are active in the life of the Indian people to-day, and the estimating of their significance in the ever-changing conditions of our times. India is not so much a nation, as a league of nations in which religion is deep rooted. It is God-intoxicated. The Pantheon of India accommodates a myriad deities, whose claims are being revived and whose worship is much influenced by political ambitions and social unrest. Until recently the religious life of India was thought to have begun with the Aryan invasion. The spade of the excavator at Mohenjo-daro in the Indus plain has revealed evidences of an earlier advanced civilization akin or superior to that of contemporary Mesopotamia and Egypt. This culture had its religious faith, and many of its concepts have passed into Hinduism. India has echoed the tramp of the invader, all through its history. Each invading wave brought new ways of thinking and of worshipping. As a result there is a unique complex of religions and races. Six faiths survive, with many modifications and shades of belief. Three religions are native to the land—Hinduism, Jainism and Sikhism. Three others have been transplanted to Indian soil. These are Islam, Zoroastrianism and Christianity. Their claim to be 'religions of India' is founded on the facts of acclimatization and adaptation. Of each faith the author recounts the chequered history, the distinctive doctrines, the inherent weaknesses, and reviews its present condition. Hinduism, being a storehouse of sentiment, is ready to adopt competing deities. Jainism and Sikhism have much in common with Hinduism. Recent years have emphasized the divisive features and to-day the faiths are distinctive. Islam in India is austere and rigid. Its vitality is sapped by the doctrine of fate and the growth of ritual. Zoroastrianism is a faith with character and achievement and is imperilled by Western science and philosophy. Christianity has a story of division and compromise, but, like all the faiths of India, it is reviving.

J. HENRY MARTIN.

The Apostolic Tradition of Hippolytus. Translated by Burton Scott Easton. (Cambridge University Press. 7s. 6d.)

This edition, containing an Introduction, text and notes, is the first attempt at a critical edition, and the first English edition of this notable work, and will be heartily welcomed by all students of Church history. In the interesting introduction, Dr. Easton draws a contrast between two types which have usually found a place in the life of the Church—the conservative represented by Hippolytus and the less rigid type by Callistus. They clashed on the Christological issue, and on the more practical matter of Church membership. To Hippolytus the Church's constant teaching since the apostles' time removed the problem from debate: Christians must be saints in the fullest sense of the word. So his flock was constantly purged by excommunication. Callistus, on the contrary, took the bold step of brushing aside tradition altogether, and of appealing directly to the New

Testament: 'Let the tares grow with the wheat until the harvest.' Apparently this question of Church membership was as thorny in the second century as it is to-day. Any editor who works over the various texts is confronted with a formidable task. Except for small fragments, the Greek text has disappeared, while the only complete text, the Ethiopic, is unreliable in many respects. The author, however, is confident that despite the difficulties arising from the four versions, he has recovered the substance of Hippolytus' rules. The text shows the inevitable movement towards organization and legislation which took place in the Church life of the period, and is full of interest, not only for those interested in the liturgical side, but for those who wish to see the Church's judgement on social matters. Hippolytus gives, for example, a list of the professions and trades which have this formula attached 'he must desist or be rejected.' 'A teacher of young children had best desist, but if he has no other occupation, he may be permitted to continue. . . . If a catechumen or a believer seeks to become a soldier, they must be rejected, for they have despised God.'

R.S.

A Primer for To-morrow. By Christian Gauss. (Charles Scribners' Sons. 10s. 6d.)

The author who has been Dean of the College at Princeton University, since 1925, has attempted with some success an analysis of, and an introduction to contemporary civilization. It is the set purpose of this book to define the malady of our culture—the lack of inner impulsion in any constant direction—and so indicate the paths towards a healthy sociology. One of the chief interests of the early part of the book is the discussion on Spengler's well known theory of the morphology of civilizations. There is no doubt that the author is qualified for this work for he can sense tendencies and indicate movements with a convincing pen. The detail with which this task of diagnosis has been undertaken can be seen in the chapter headings: The disappearance of Sanctions, The reversal of the Time Sense, The decline of Religion, The Rise of Capitalism, The threat of Science, The end of Nationalism, Will there be a Social Revolution? to name only a few. The genesis of the modern spirit is carefully outlined in order to explain the nature of the forces that surround us to-day. The three new forces of the progressive era are seen in nationalism, capitalism and science. Finally we have a frank portrayal of the logical outcome of materialism as seen in the Soviet system. The attraction of the complete secularization of every phase of life can be readily understood once the necessary premise is granted. This is a worthwhile book. It represents a vast amount of research and it shows the author to have a keen eye for movements that are beneath the surface.

B.

A Jungle Jaunt and what came of it, by H. A. Meek (Epworth Press. 2s. 6d.), is a new edition of a charming book which has many adventures and ends with a notable conversion of a Tamil youth who becomes pastor in his native village.

GENERAL

Music and Religion. By Brian Wibberley, Mus. Bac.
(Epworth Press. 10s. 6d.)

Religion as the greatest human activity is attracting the attention of expert investigators as perhaps never before, and since religion is so generally interpreted in terms of worship, and worship is so widely expressed in music, the connexion between music and religion appears natural and inevitable. So from the simple antiphonal hymn of apostolic times to the majestic Gregorian chant, from the medieval trope to the polyphonic mass, then onward through psalmody, hymnody, and specialized forms such as the chorale, the anthem, the Passion music, and the oratorio—through all these stages the commanding Christian idea has persisted, clothed in music's glorious garb, and Wagner even confesses that 'the only music which now at least, we can place on the same footing as the other arts is an exclusive product of Christianity.' Having established this basis in his Introduction, the writer divides his subject into two books and each book into two divisions. In book first, division one deals with music in non-Christian religions; Maori, Fijian, Hottentot, Malay, Zulu. Polytheistic religions, Egyptian, Assyrio-Babylonian, Chinese, Indian, classic and Teutonic paganism are examined, and this chapter, like many others, shows the wide range of research covered by the author. Monotheistic religions, Hebrew and Mohammedan, are discussed, and it may be noted that the writer differs from those authorities who consider that the Hebrews had some knowledge of harmony. He maintains that both their vocal and their instrumental music were unisonal and of a very simple character, 'more loud than lovely.' Music in the Christian religion of course occupies an important place, over a hundred pages of the volume. The ancient era is divided into Primitive, Ambrosian, and Gregorian periods, and this leads on to the Medieval era when harmony arose, gradually yielding to polyphony. It is satisfactory to note the deserved honour paid to John Dunstable who introduced the 'new art,' an honour long postponed as many of his compositions were written abroad and have only been discovered in recent times in the cathedral libraries of Trent, Bologna and other cities. Copies of these motets, and other music by the way, have now been made and lodged in the British Museum. But Dunstable and all others were soon surpassed by the unrivalled Palestrina, of whom Parry says, 'As long as religion lasts Palestrina's music will be the purest and loftiest form in which it has been expressed!' A chapter entitled The Modern Era shows how music was affected by the Renaissance. The printing of Gutenberg, the discovery of America by Columbus, the astronomy of Copernicus, and the critical scholarship of Erasmus led to the religious reforms of Luther. The old *capella* was superseded, and the pure choral style was replaced by the new accompanied dramatic monody. The

oratorio and musical drama arose and instrumental music, which if used at all, had merely doubled the voice parts, now asserted itself as an independent phase of musical art. These points are illustrated from the music of the Greek, Roman, and Reformed churches of the continent, including the Lutheran, with its culmination in J. S. Bach, who transferred the palm from Italy to Germany. An account of the music of the Anglican Church, English Nonconformity, and specialized forms of music such as the carol, the mass, the oratorio bring to a close the first portion of the book which is described as Organic and Historical. The second portion of the volume is philosophical and constructive. It deals with the criteria of religion and music, and the relation between music and religion. An extensive field of observation is laid under contribution, including the postulates of religion, the rationale of music and its relation to psychology and æsthetics, the musical faculty and the religious consciousness, music and the absolute and the characteristic in religion, and in conclusion ideals and actualities are compared. The author charges the modern church music with want of perception, false ideas and faulty practices, and suggests desiderata for congregation, choir and organist. Fundamental demands are that religious music should be significant, appropriate, and worthy. Mr. Wibberley has given us a notable book, written with copious literary illustration, and in an interesting style which music lovers will study with delight. We could have wished for musical illustration of certain points, but this would have increased considerably the bulk of the volume. Moreover, while we appreciate the admirable syllabus at the beginning of the book, we should have liked an index at the end to facilitate reference to the numerous topics so capably treated by this gifted Australian writer.

A. E. SHARPLEY.

Noble Experiment. By Sidney B. Whipple. (Methuen & Co. 5s.)

This is a lurid portrait of 'America under Prohibition' which sets out the tyranny of gangster, gunman and corrupt politician rising strangely out of a well-meant crusade for racial welfare. A Prologue describes the situation in the last year of the Prohibition Era when 'Liquor is plentiful and the entire population above the age of fifteen appears to be on familiar terms with it.' The record opens in Kansas, in 1899, when Mrs. David Nation made her attack on Martin Strong's saloon, swept bottles from the bar and drove the drinkers from their seats. She made the nation think, even as they scoffed. The progress towards Prohibition had begun, and made steady advance to its victory by the adoption of the Eighteenth Amendment which came into effect on January 16, 1920. Mr. Whipple describes the problems that had then to be faced. Every city and State had scores of industries entitled to receive alcohol, and at least one-third of this went to the drinkers. Within two years 'even the interior of the United States began to get on a solid drinking foundation, with its supplies ready-made, close at hand, or more expensively brought by devious channels over

hundreds of miles from the nearest border.' The worst result was that in the first five years the support of the law and obedience to it began to change. After a time of self-denial and honest resolution to keep the pledge, a little furtive backsliding followed, and 'finally, open disregard of the principle behind the law and the frank conniving with—and even consorting with—the law-breakers.' Two bleak little islands to the south of Newfoundland became the centre of importations from Canadian distilleries, which went down the St. Lawrence to St. Pierre and through the Atlantic lanes to the twelve-mile limit, where it was transferred to a swift motor-boat, dodged a fleet of determined coast-guard ships, and found its way to New York 'to rest behind an Onyx bar, to be quaffed at a dollar an ounce.' Painful instances are given of the network of bribery and corruption. The small town of Ecorse, a makeshift free port to the great city of Detroit, was used by the speed-boats from Canada, and from its labyrinth of tunnels and underground storehouses great motor-lorries went out at night loaded with liquor for Chicago or for Detroit. Al Capone became the most notorious man in America, and captured the city of Cicero, on the dirty fringe of Chicago, as his feudal stronghold. That is a terrible story, and second to it is the capture of the medicinal whisky market by George Remus, whose centre of operations was Death Valley Farm, near Cincinnati. He was not a gangster like Capone, but armed with Government permits, obtained by bribery or otherwise, his motor-caravans rumbled over the six Middle-Western States, dropping a case of whisky here and ten cases there according to orders received at headquarters. Jack Diamond, a sinister figure, graduated in crime at New York and worked his way into the front rank of the city's bootleggers. Mr. Whipple thinks that the psychological effect of depression had a marked influence on the 'apparent reversal of national feeling towards the Eighteenth Amendment.' The bootleggers' affluence and arrogance in a time of national distress created resentment. The illegal purveyors had cost the Government \$310,000,000 in ten years, and the nation's yearly drink bill had risen to more than four billion dollars, of which a quarter would have gone to the Treasury, a sum equal to the income taxes of a year. Prohibition came to an end with a flush of pleasure, but this was soon followed by dumb resentment at the high prices and poor quality of the liquor.

There was a wide increase in the consumption of wines, with a steadily decreasing demand for harder liquors and malt beverages. The thirteen years of Prohibition have lent added weight to the problem of reducing alcoholic excesses and producing a truly sober nation. All the world followed the experiment with wonder and with the keenest interest. Its failure forces us back on the slower but more enduring methods—the appeal to reason and enlightened opinion. Shakespeare sounded a true temperance note: 'O that men should put an enemy in their mouths, to steal away their brains!'

Hobbes. By John Laird. (Leaders of Philosophy Series.)
(Ernest Benn Limited. 12s. 6d.)

This is a book for the scholars, not for the general reader. It is fully documented, which is a great gain to the first-hand student of Hobbes. But the method adopted of giving Hobbes's opinion in Hobbes's own words, and with reference in every case to the source, while it ensures accuracy, does not make for simple and interesting exposition. The book is in three parts. Part 1 gives a brief account of the writer and his works, and of what it called the 'climate' in which his opinions came to birth. His indebtedness to Bacon and Descartes, the two greatest contemporary thinkers, and to others less well known, is discussed; and an account is given of the ideas that were 'in the air' in that stormy mid-seventeenth-century period when modernism was arising out of the grave of medievalism, and the political world was in such confusion. Part 2 contains the exposition of Hobbes's philosophy. He was the first great English thinker who attempted to work out a strictly materialistic system. His fundamental principle was that all the properties presented to us by phenomena can be traced to one cause—motion. He sought to elaborate his ideas in a three-fold system, dealing with Matter, Man and the State. In a series of books he succeeded in carrying out his design, though not in the logical order. It is the last part of his philosophy, devoted to Ethics and Politics, that has bulked largest in the history of thought. Hobbes was the great exponent of the Sovereignty of the State. The Government, whatever its outward form, must rule absolutely; even in the sphere of religion it must decide all matters of controversy. The duty of the citizens was that of unquestioning obedience. Part 3 is devoted to Hobbes's influence on subsequent thought. That has perhaps been greater on the Continent than in this country. The Contract idea of Society, which he was the first to take as the basis of his sociology, had a great vogue for two centuries. As Hobbes had made it the foundation of Conservatism, so Locke made it the foundation of Liberalism. It came to full fruition in Rousseau, and has since fallen into a state of neglect. That Hobbes was a capable thinker who could state his ideas with clearness and force, and that he must always occupy a big place in the history of philosophy, is indisputable. That he has anything vital to say to our age is more open to question.

E. B. STORR.

Life and Soul—Outlines of a Future Theoretical Physiology and of a Critical Philosophy. By Max Loewenthal.
(Allen & Unwin. 8s. 6d.)

The author of this remarkable book claims to show the characteristic difference between living and inanimate matter. Here is the product of the better part of a lifetime and it deals with a subject of fascinating interest, not only to scientists, biologists, philosophers and theologians, but to all who dig deep into the secrets of Nature. Much of it is technical, of course, and the study of it sets the grey matter in motion

and gives a tonic to the mental system. The book shews how all science is debtor to a few theories and a few facts upon which its whole superstructure has been built just as language has been constructed from a few roots. Theory, however, must have a solid foundation. Physiological anatomy has its cellular theory—that the whole body is derived from a single cell. It is this possession of a working theory which renders science interpretative. The author points out that physiology with all its accumulation of facts has no hypothesis regarding the *nature* of life. Life must have some characteristic feature *never* found in inanimate bodies. He combats Huxley's theory that life is nothing but a chemical process and living matter nothing but a chemical composition of special construction and great complexity. The discussion of such subjects as catabolism, anabolism and metabolism can only be followed by experts in these things and there is much in the first section of the book which is beyond the reach of the ordinary reader. In the second part he discusses the mind, its place in nature and its relation to matter. There is no bridge, he says, from the atom or electron to the sensations. This second section is less technical and is lit up with many effective illustrations and diagrams. There is a chapter on 'Immortality' dealing with resurrection, memory, change and annihilation. The final chapter treats of determinism and animism.

E. J. T. BAGNALL.

The New Philanthropy. By Elizabeth Macadam, M.A.
(Allen & Unwin. 7s. 6d)

This is the first attempt at a comprehensive description and discussion of the relation between the much-criticized social services and the innumerable forms of private, charitable and social effort. Her experience, mainly in Liverpool and London, as a social worker and lecturer in the Social Science School of Liverpool University, has prepared the writer for such a task and she considers the problems of home assistance, the health and housing services, education in the elementary school and outside it in a practical way. The freedom of association has a national value and it is difficult to believe that it will not always remain part of the structure of British society. It may assume fresh forms but it is so strong that dictatorships from the left or the right will batter in vain against it. The book is one that will greatly help social workers in all spheres. It is lucid and full of wide knowledge and true insight.

Shall Cancer Conquer Unopposed? By H. Reinheimer. (The Avenue, Surbiton. 2s.)

This is the No. 7 in the writer's Cancer Campaign. He is confident that the terrible disease is 'due to transgressions against nutritional laws, more particularly as constituted by our inglorious meat-eating habits.' We have to remedy certain flaws due to heredity and thus strengthen the factors that make for the 'integrity of all life' and

diminish those which cause disharmony and disintegration. We owe no small debt to one who is carrying on such a campaign as Mr. Reinheimer's.

The Mystery of Godliness, by K. L. Parry, B.Sc. (Stockwell, 2s. 6d.), takes its title from the first of the ten sermons. The fountain-head of all mystery is the Cross. Christ left us with His dying breath that superb legacy of faith: 'Father, into Thy hands I commend My Spirit.' The sermons have attractive themes: The Man Jesus Loved; The Hidden Life; The Lakes of Praise; and are really helpful, well illustrated and always arresting.

Teaching Junior Boys and Girls, by Mildred Moody Eakin. (Cincinnati Book Concern. \$1.10.). Every side of this subject is discussed with practical knowledge and striking glimpses of the child mind. Sports as well as lessons are dealt with and there is a fine moral and religious tone in it all.

Skeffington & Son have added *The Valley of the Echoes*, by George Bettany to their sixpenny editions of popular novels. It is in its 20th thousand and no wonder. It is a story of an Indian rising and a marvellous defence set up by Billy McLeod. There is fighting and adventure which causes many a thrill, and a love story which crowns all the perils. It is a fascinating tale.

Through Magic Casements, by T. W. Coleman (Epworth Press. 2s. 6d.), gives twenty-five stories for children and all who have to do with them. They will find much here to enjoy and many a good lesson will be happily learnt.

Companioned by Angels, by Wilfrid H. Bourne (Epworth Press. 3s. 6d.), is a volume of essays enriched by a Foreword from Mr. Coulson Kernahan and full of good things to brood over in the company of the angels.

Dictatorship and the Free Churches, by Thomas Edmunds, is an address delivered at the Free Church Council in Leicester. It surveys the action of dictatorship in politics and in a Free Church Community, discusses Free-Churchism versus Sacerdotalism and pleads strongly for a United Free Church in England. The conversion of men and women is the only way to escape the perils of a semi-moralized democracy. It is an important statement and presented with vigour and conviction. (Leicester: 61 London Road. 3d.)

Periodical Literature

BRITISH

Hibbert Journal (July).—Dr. Jacks continues his critique of 'M. Loisy on the Birth of Christianity.' M. Loisy assigns the birth of Christianity to the moment or the brief period when the message of Jesus, 'The Reign of God is at hand,' passed into the form 'The Lord is at hand,' the Lord being Jesus now transfigured into the Christ. The Gospel, thus transfigured, soon found missionaries eager to proclaim it. 'It is an astonishing story, perhaps the greatest wonder story in the world.' Dr. Foakes-Jackson writes on 'Christian Origins and Developments.' He finds a new interest in Church History as 'the same record of the strife between the human and the divine element in life, a story full of dramatic incidents, a tale of many futile efforts, relieved by noble aspirations and heroic acts.' Dr. A. W. Harrison in the 'Philosophy of D. H. Lawrence' cannot doubt that the flame of genius burnt in him, but wonders that so many of our intellectuals should give such unstinted admiration to his bankruptcy of clear thinking on the meaning of life.

Expository Times (June).—Dr. Yates writes on 'The Message of the First Epistle of Peter.' The letter tells what grace did for him and is a message to Christians who are already facing suffering. His passage about the 'spirits in prison' put 'the Harrowing of Hell' into Christian poetry. Professor Moffatt describes the correspondence between 'Abailard and Héloise' which shows the interest which a gifted woman took in the study of the Bible in twelfth-century France. The questions she put to her teacher are often more acute than his answers. She knew her classics, especially the Latin poets. The sisters at the convent had been reading Matthew's Gospel with special care, and no doubt Abailard had led them to choose his favourite Gospel for their study. Her problems showed that Héloise was evidently much more interested in exegesis than her teacher. (July).—Dr. Vincent Taylor writes on 'Second Peter and Jude.' They have a real message for to-day. Both came from a period when Christianity had lost its first glow, when the bonds of morality were in danger of being relaxed, and doubts of God's intervention in history were troubling the minds of many. The relation between the two Epistles is discussed and special stress is laid on their message for to-day. Dr. Flew's *Idea of Perfection in Christian Theology* is described as a masterly achievement, and Dr. Bonsall's *Outline of Hinduism* as 'a difficult task serviceably done.' The articles on 'Marcion' and on 'Natural Religion and Revelation' are valuable. (August).—The first 'Notes of Recent Exposition' are given to Dr. Flew's *Idea of Perfection*, dwelling on its masterly survey of the history of the doctrine and making suggestions for creative theological work. Dean J. G. Simpson

writes on the 'Message of St. John's Epistles'; President Whale on 'Montanus'; and the Rev. G. P. Thomas on 'Bede.' Mr. Wibberley's *Music and Religion* receives special notice.

Journal of Theological Studies (July).—Dr. Armitage Robinson's account of The Didache, Part I takes the chief place in this number with additional notes by Dom Connolly. The author keeps in the background and allows his work to stand on its own merits: it is 'The Teaching of the Lord, through the Twelve Apostles, to the Gentiles.' He does not copy the words of any particular apostle; it is enough that what he writes should be such as apostles might very well have said. He nowhere speaks of angel or devil; though such a silence is almost, if not quite, unique in the early Christian writers. The comparison of Codex D. and Codex A. in passages of John and Luke; Studies in the Mozarabic office; and Dr. M. James's account of the strange Salomite myth which made Salome a man and the third wife of the Virgin Mary's mother are interesting contributions.

Church Quarterly (July).—The Bishop of Gloucester's article, 'The Doctrine of God,' is part of his work on *Christian Theology, the Doctrine of God*, to be published by the Clarendon Press. He contrasts the Christian doctrine with Deism, Pantheism, Dualism, and Materialism, discusses how far man can have a knowledge of God, and the relation of God to Nature, to Mankind, and to human freedom. 'The Egyptian Texts of the Gospels and Acts' and 'Francis William Newman' are other subjects in this number.

Congregational Quarterly (July).—Dr. Peel's Editorials are a strong appeal to face up to the trying situation which worship now has to meet. The brief tribute to R. F. Horton; Angus Watson's 'Faith of a Business Man,' with its high-toned courage; 'The doctrine of the Church,' by Prof. Cadoux, are some of the features in this good number.

Baptist Quarterly (July).—Dr. Ryder Smith in 'Methodism and Baptism' describes Wesley's position as seen in his *Journal* and *Sermons* and then passes to the dominant view of Wesleyan Methodism in the nineteenth century. Dr. George Howells deals with 'Christian Problems.' Some are settled, others, like those of comparative religion and the detailed application of the Christian ideal to the varied problems of our time, still await solution. There are notes on local church history and a full account of 'Joseph Collet: A Baptist Governor of Madras in 1716.'

Bulletin of Rylands Library (July).—'Notes and News' deals with many subjects of importance, such as the growth of Manchester University, additions to the Rylands Library, and other matters. The special papers on 'Nietzsche and Goethe'; 'Sumerian Civilization under the Third Dynasty of Ur'; 'Prehistoric Elements in our Heritage,' 'The Abolitionist Movement in Sheffield' and 'Sir John Fortescue and the Law of Nature' cover a wide field and are of very varied interest.

Cornhill (July).—Mr. Paston continues his series, 'New Light on Byron's Loves' which is really heart-rending. 'The Lady of Corfe Castle' is a vivid account of the great siege. Miss Rohde's little paper on 'Shakespeare's Roses' is charming. 'A Frontier Expedition' against the Chins; 'Libyan Memories,' and the extraordinary 'Shikar and Sorcery,' the tale of a man-eating tiger's defeat by an iron spike supplied by the Indian holy man, is 'an actual experience' which passes the bounds of belief.

British Journal of Inebriety (July).—The main feature is the Commemoration Address delivered by Sir Humphry Rolleston in connexion with the Jubilee of the Society for the Study and Cure of Inebriety founded by Dr. Norman Kerr in 1884. He was Honorary Secretary of the Cedars at Rickmansworth licensed under the Habitual Drunkards Act. The history of the Society and its chief supporters is one of which temperance workers are justly proud.

Nature Lover (August).—Mackenzie Bell's account of Michael Fairless makes a strong appeal to lovers of *The Roadmender*. It has illustrations of her last home and the memorial cross in Ashurst graveyard and a charming portrait. There are papers on 'The Red Admiral Butterfly,' on 'The Ash' as one of the glorious trees of Britain, on birds and stars and flowers. It is a real treasure house for lovers of Nature.

Goodwill (July).—The Editorial Notes cover many sides of International Church Life and the World Situation. The Bishop of Birmingham in his sermon at the National Peace Congress, argued that 'the nation which renounces armaments would not incite fear nor be offensive to the national pride of other nations.' The Council Meeting at Bristol; American Churches and Peace; Church and State in Europe To-day and The Protestant Church in Austria are important articles.

AMERICAN

Harvard Theological Review.—In his article in the April number entitled 'A prophetic attestation of the Decalogue' Dr. Shalom Spiegel describes Hos. vi. 5, as 'a dark and delphic verse,' but he adds 'nowhere is the familiar refuge of the fatigued philologist, "corrupt beyond restoration," more regrettable.' The R.V. rendering is: 'Therefore have I hewed them by the prophets; I have slain them by the words of my mouth: and thy judgements are as the light that goeth forth.' Dr. Spiegel concludes, after a critical study of the text, that Hos. vi. 1-6 is an echo of the liturgy of penitential days and is indeed 'a poetical reproduction of the liturgy of penitential fasts.' By changing a letter in the Hebrew script he translates: 'In rock have I hewn, Through prophets made it known, In words of my mouth my creed Went forth clearly as the sun.' It is claimed that the suggested emendation meets Driver's critical tests, and that if the reconstruction be true, the verse contains 'the earliest, definite and dated, literary attestation of the decalogue.'

The Journal of Religion.—(July).—Dr. Bixler in 'The Patriot and the Pragmatist' reaches the conclusion that Truth in the last pragmatic analysis, is 'both amenable to practical demands, and discoverable in the light of human need. The world is a place where men can live together harmoniously, and its spiritual quality is discovered when they do.' 'The concept of Morality in the Philosophy of Jonathan Edwards,' 'Missions, Culture, and Social Change,' 'The Fourth Gospel and the Struggle for Respectability' are part of the rich material in this number.

Religion and Life.—(Summer Number).—Dr. Edgar Park writes on 'What my Religion means to me,' Mr. Birch Hoyle on 'The Holy Ghost in Mystical Experience.' 'Form Criticism' is a survey of the criticism which seeks to recover the form or forms in which the Gospel tradition existed before it was committed to writing. The articles on 'Rethinking Ministerial Education' and 'Two Views of Religious Education' are very timely.

FOREIGN

Moslem World (July).—Particulars are given of the Mecca Pilgrimage. The Hijaz Government fixes rates and stages for the journey from port to port. Garages and mechanics for repairs are provided at all centres. Houses are guaranteed clean and hygienic; pilgrims may claim free medical treatment. They should boil drinking water and use an umbrella if compelled to go about in the heat of the day. The seaborne pilgrims fell from 97,635 in 1928 to 19,259 in 1933. 'The Arabs of Oman' are very religious but much more tolerant and open-minded than those of the north. The attitude at a religious meeting is usually one of intense and real inquiry.

Transactions of the Bose Research Institute, Calcutta. Vol. viii.

This volume of Biological and Physical Researches is edited by Sir Jagadis Chunder Bose who says the object of the Research Institute is the pursuit of investigations in different branches of knowledge. Among the results described in this volume is the study of possible differential action of water disturbance and of vegetable extracts on different fishes. Other researches include the responsive movements of leaflets under strong light and under darkness; the excitatory impulse in ordinary plants; the effect of external stimulus on diametric growth of stems; the comparative study of the effect of drugs on the rhythmic tissues of animal and plant. An interesting account is given of the racial affinities of the Mundas, an aboriginal race of the Chota Nagpur hills, who speak both the Austrie and Dravidian forms of speech. They have sturdy and well-developed limbs, the colour of the skin is chocolate brown approaching black, and the stature is short. Many photographs help a reader to study the heads and features of this remarkable people. All the articles are well illustrated by the 131 illustrations. The Institute is doing valuable work in many directions.

